THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XIX.—JULY, 1894.—No. 75.

DOM GASQUET AS A HISTORIAN.

"Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries," London, 1888.
"Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer," 1890.
"The Great Pestilence of 1348–9," 1894.

THERE is a theory that every time supplies its own needs, and thus the present era has brought forth Dom Gasquet. A time like ours, when misrepresentation of religious history, long put forward in crude and grotesque forms, has suddenly changed in shape and color and is cultivated into a fine art, demands a writer possessing not only a ready pen but a correct mind and a calm temper; a historian at once wise and courageous, who should go about his work of research in the equable, painstaking spirit that leaves no corners unexplored, and set forth the whole truth almost without comment for reasonable men to see and draw therefrom their own inference. Such a historian is Dom Francis Aidan Gasquet, the learned and reverend Benedictine of Downside.

Dom Gasquet's work has been to trace from their earliest sources the causes and developments of the Reformation in England. No periods of history have been more thickly overlaid by the inventions and misinterpretations of prejudice than the Middle Ages and the subsequent epoch of the Reformation; yet, even so, the false witnesses agree not together of late years; one party in the Established Church have advanced a theory not accepted by the other party who abhor the name of Catholic—the astounding theory of the oneness of "the Tudor settlement" with the old Catholic Church of England. It might be thought superfluous to call forth writers of mark to prove that white is white and black

black; yet when we see well-meaning and even saintly souls deceived by the modern fallacy, we gladly welcome such historians as Dom Gasquet, Father Bridgett, Miss Allies, and the late Father Morris, to point out what the Church of England really was, and how great a gulf divides it from the modern Church which took possession of all its fabrics and adopted a few of its ceremonies.

Dom Gasquet has especially devoted himself to the periods and events bearing on the severance of England from the faith, not treating particularly of ancient devotions or even of ecclesiastical history, except so far as they are necessary to his chief aim. He never allows himself to stray into the tempting fields of semi-irrelevant disquisitions, for which years of hard work among archives and records must have given him plentiful opportunities. His calm, judicial writing, free from all rhetorical flourish, is like a charge delivered by a judge scrupulously devoid of bias. It is, in fact, to the common sense of all English-speaking people, as to a jury, that Dom Gasquet appeals, to pronounce on the array of facts marshalled before them. "My belief is," he says, alluding to the change of the national religion and dissolution of the monasteries by Henry VIII., "that the facts speak strongly enough for themselves, and I have endeavored to add as little as possible of my own to the story they tell."

So great a revolution as that which changed the Isle of Saints into a Protestant country could not but be the result of subterranean forces long at work. Its earliest cause, in our author's opinion, is to be looked for in the fourteenth century. He had already, in his preface to "Henry VIII. and the Monasteries," attributed to the plague called the Black Death an untoward influence on the religious life of England, and in his latest book on "The Great Pestilence of 1348–9," he gives us a vivid picture of the terrible visitation which half unpeopled Europe, and swept away much of the old stately order of things.

Such a work, indeed, was a service to general history, for hitherto no authentic data had been published of a calamity which paralyzed the life of all the nations of the known world, and "formed the real close of the mediæval period and beginning of our modern age." The very greatness of the destruction seemed to deter historians from seeking out the details. But Dom Gasquet has supplied this want. Having consulted foreign contemporary writers, such as De Chanliac, physician to Pope Clement VI., Petrarch, and others, as to the approach and symptoms of the plague and the havoc it wrought in the Continent, he has traced its progress in England by means of the only trustworthy statistics, the diocesan registers and the records of manorial courts. According to his habit, he carefully avoids giving the rein to the imagination, and

his cool calculation produces a much stronger impression than do the exaggerations of writers of the Defoe type, in whose rhetorical pages "horrors on horrors' heads accumulate," while yet the reader is left with a hope that all may not have been true!

The westward march of the pestilence brought it within the space of some two years from China to the shores of England and Ireland. It was like the influenza in its universality, though, of course, incomparably more fatal. It was distinguished from the ordinary Eastern plagues, which otherwise it resembled, by a violent inflammation of the lungs, and was one of the most virulently contagious diseases ever known, and quite the most incurable, at least by the medical science of those days. After ravaging the south of Europe and France, it burst upon England at a time of great glory and prosperity, when the nation was elated by the victory of Crécy and taking of Calais, and enriched with the spoils of the vanquished enemy. It spread across the land from Weymouth, where it appeared in the late summer of 1348. A wet autumn helped the plague on its way, winter failed to check its ravages, and far into the summer of the following year death was an equal chance with life in the fields and towns of Merry England. But the agony of selfish fear which accompanied the footsteps of the pestilence in Italy does not seem to have been so strongly marked in northern countries. The English priesthood in particular were, as a rule, true to their duties, and perished in the midst of their flocks. It is chiefly by the mortality of the clergy, as evidenced by the frequent institutions to benefices, that Dom Gasquet gauges the amount of the general carnage. He reckons the deaths of beneficed clergy as five thousand, and estimates their proportion to the unbeneficed and religious as one to four, thus concluding that twenty-five thousand must have fallen in all. "Estimating the clergy at one per cent. of the population, and supposing a like ratio of deaths, the total mortality would be about 2,500,000. This total is curiously the same as that estimated from the basis of population returns made at the close of the memorable reign of Edward III., evidencing a total population, before the outbreak of the epidemic, at some 5,000,000" (p. 205). Thus it would appear that when the pestilence had passed away, one-half of the population had perished.

An unparalleled calamity naturally produced unparalleled results in both social and religious life. Early in the course of the pestilence the death of clergy began to make itself felt. Thus the Bishop of Bath and Wells, a number of his parish priests having already fallen, and others being, unfortunately, unwilling to take the vacant cures, owing to the almost entire failure of the stipend, exhorted the sick who could find no priest to attend them, to make

confession to a layman, or even to a woman, "an act salutary and profitable for the remission of sins, according to the teaching of the sacred canons of the Church" (p. 82). At the same time he granted an indulgence to all those who, while yet in health, should confess to a priest "having the keys of the church," and thus place themselves in a state of grace before the destroyer overtook them. The Archbishop of York obtained the Pope's permission to ordain at any time, and the Bishop of Norwich to confer the priesthood on sixty clerics of twenty-one, "though only shavelings, as otherwise the divine offices would cease altogether in many places of his diocese."[1] The desolation of the country was extreme. Monasteries almost emptied of their inhabitants, villages depopulated, fields unreaped, mill-wheels standing idle in the water, cattle and sheep either dead of the murrain or wandering untended about the neglected lands; such were the surroundings in which those of our ancestors who had survived drew their frightened breath in the year 1350.

"This great pestilence," writes Dom Gasquet, "was a turning-point in the national life. It produced a break with the past, and was the dawn of a new era." With regard to religion "it is not too much to say that in 1351 the whole ecclesiastical system was wholly disorganized, or, indeed, more than half ruined, and that everything had to be built up anew." Built up it was, for the recuperative power of the ages of faith was immense, but the scars of the great earthquake remained. Holy men like Bishop Wykeham strove to supply for the want of education and tone noticeable in the priesthood ordained since the pestilence. A fresh school of religious writers arose, and of these Dom Gasquet says that their tracts have been roughly classed by Protestant criticism as "Wycliffite," "on account of their deeply religious spirit, whereas a Catholic reader will at once recognize that these tracts are perfectly Catholic in tone, spirit, and teaching, and differ essentially from those of men inspired by the teaching of Wycliffe." The strikes and trades-unions consquent on the dearth of labor found a Catholic expression and safeguard in the guilds which everywhere sprang into existence; and the rise of the *bourgeois* class added to the richness, if not always to the good taste, of church decoration. But although the undying youthfulness of the Church was visible in a renewal of religious feeling, the destruction which had taken place was too great for rapid replacement.

The great pestilence had everywhere had a demoralizing effect,

[1] One cannot but wonder how special pleaders like Mr. Lane, who go about informing the people that the Church in England was always independent of Rome, explain away these references of English bishops to the Pope on every occasion where extraordinary dispensations were required.

and was accompanied by panic, fear, and a loosening of family and social ties. Though England does not seem to have been disgraced by the wild orgies which the Florentines and others held in the very jaws of death, a monk of Rochester has left on record that after the plague "the people for the greater part were even more depraved, more forgetful of God and of their own salvation." So many monks and nuns had died, and those often, as Wadding the Irish Franciscan historian observes, "that it was long before strict observance could be renewed in the religious houses." The picture drawn in "Rienzi" of the nunnery in Florence, where one living sister kneels in prayer amid the laid-out corpses of the community, was no exaggeration; such wholesale destruction was not uncommon, and must have slackened or destroyed many of the best traditions of monastic life. Among the secular clergy the "shavelings," ordained in great batches, and without much regard to their theological attainments, in order that the land might not be without Divine service, could not supply for the loss of the thousands of noble priests who had inherited the spirit of the old English saints, and who fell at their post in the day of visitation.

The great material calamity which desolated Europe in 1348–9 was most unfortunately followed by an unexampled spiritual misfortune, the Great Western Schism; and both these evils had a large share in producing the decay of religious feeling which sapped the strength and fervor of men's minds in the fifteenth century. In England that century brought forth a new source of demoralization in the War of the Roses, culminating in the Tudor despotism, which narrowed into a one-man tyranny in the breadth and fulness of the days of English glory under the Plantagenets.

Thus did events slowly and fatally tend towards the beginning of that era of which we now seem to be nearing the end, and which stands out sharply and distinctly from all previous religious life in England. A lowering of religious tone, a worldly, covetous, selfish spirit displacing Christian faith, charity, and humility; a tyrant king—and the Isle of Saints has dropped out of Catholic unity for, perhaps, four centuries.

Amid endless phases we can yet clearly trace three distinct epochs of "Anglicanism"; the first, when the Apostolic Succession and the great body of Catholic doctrine were still retained; the second, one of transition and confusion, in the course of which the old Catholic episcopacy dropped out of the "Tudor Settlement"; the third, that of Protestant sectarianism still prevailing, in which every man chooses his own doctrines, and the pseudo-bishops are merely state officials with but little spiritual influence. The fourth phase, in the mercy of Providence, will be the gradual and individual return of the English nation to the faith of "Eleu-

therius, Augustine, and Columba." The space of four centuries will, in all probability, have included the whole history of the separation of England from the Church—the first tearing asunder, royal violence, martyrdoms, servile submissions, reconciliation and second fall, Protestantism, Puritanism, the Oxford movement, the new Catholic leanings and imitations, and the final re-absorption in St. Peter's fold. In the annals of the world the career of Anglicanism will seem but a short madness and a small thing in the bird's-eye view of the student; and yet it is not a small thing which concerns millions of souls or one soul, not a small thing, that in the words of Henry VIII. himself to Luther, "through the disobedience of one man many should become sinners."

"I think the world was never before so generally inclined to listen to heresy as it is now," the Blessed John Fisher wrote in 1529, as he contemplated a Germany already infected with Lutheranism, and an Italy half paganized by the *brevis furor* of the Rénaissance. One cause of heretical tendencies the Bishop of Rochester seems to have pointed out to the English clergy at a synod convened by Cardinal Wolsey, where he denounced the worldliness then prevailing in the clerical state, and with the fearlessness which often appears in very gentle characters, "framed his words after such sort that the cardinal perceived himself to be touched to the very quick."[1] Wolsey, indeed, embodied the unspiritual tone of mind abroad in his day, and was nearly as much an object-lesson of what a priest ought not to be as Blessed Fisher was an example of priestly and episcopal perfection; and unfortunately the type of York abounded far more than did the type of Rochester. Preaching had fallen into disuse, especially in the country districts, and its revival was a matter which the holy bishop had much at heart. The employment of the clergy in secular offices, and attendance of bishops at court, withdrew them from spiritual duties, and filled them with worldly ambitions. It appears, however, that after Wolsey's fall the Convocation of Canterbury drew up a code to enforce the ancient discipline of the Church of England, and ecclesiastical reform would probably have been the order of the day had not the matter of the king's divorce thrust every other interest aside, and entailed the royal supremacy and national schism as its direct consequences.

It may seem to Catholics superfluous to point out once more how palpably the schism sprang from the divorce, so that, with no process of unearthing whatever, one can see the stalk growing out of that noxious root. For a long time it was openly admitted by Protestants, that "Gospel light first dawned from Boleyn's eyes";[2]

[1] *Life of the Blessed John Fisher*, by the Rev. T. E Bridgett, C SS R. London, 1888, p. 76.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

nor did they seem disconcerted at having accepted so apocryphal an evangel. But now the extraordinary contention is that the present established Church of England is continuous with that which existed before the schism ; and though the task of proving that two and two are four might seem at first sight beneath the powers of the group of great Catholic historians whom Providence has lately raised up to us, a falsehood which deludes souls is always worth dispelling. It is therefore not amiss to repeat that up to the year 1534, the Church of England was in full communion with the See of Rome, and that the Pope held a distinct position in the laws of England as ruler of spiritualities. Bracton, chief justiciary in the time of Henry III., wrote that, "As the Lord Pope has jurisdiction over all in spiritual things, so has the king in temporal things. . . . . Let neither put his sickle in the other's field." This clear view of the distinct offices of Pope and king best explains the oath of fealty taken by the English bishops to the sovereign on institution to their sees. To give them spiritual jurisdiction belonged to the Pope alone, nor could the king's nominees exercise it until they had been accepted in consistory by the Head of the Church.[1] The Pope's name stood in every missal throughout the land, and Henry made a great point of expunging it thence when his own Supreme Headship was to be forced on the Church and nation. Until then, no one thought of disputing the spiritual supremacy of the *primus inter pares ;* even Rufus, in his quarrel with St. Anselm about the pallium, had not gone to these lengths ; nor would Henry have made himself a spectacle to men and angels as the lay head of a Church, had the Pope been willing to retain his allegiance at the cost of violating the sanctity with which Christ has forever sealed the sacrament of marriage.

The evil spirit which now possessed Henry speedily gathered to itself seven other spirits, foremost among which was the passion of greed, pointing out the religious houses as meet to be despoiled for the repletion of his treasury. Thomas Cromwell might almost be called the incarnation of this passion. He was at least its pitiless minister, until the day when his own turn came to be cast aside and hurried to the tower, whence his only exit was but the same as that of the noble souls whom Henry had martyred. But for the tragedy which outstripped the comedy of this terrible reign, it must have been ludicrous to see such a king and such a minister seriously concerned about the morals of the monasteries.

[1] This undoubted position of the English Episcopate was well brought out by the Rev. J. Breen, O.S.B., in the latest of his historical lectures, when armed with authentic documents he cleared away several cobwebs of the Protestant imagination. He brought forward Archbishop Warham's historical assertion of the dependence from all time of the English Church on the Holy See; and showed incidentally how Warham's own orders were derived, through John A. Stratford, from a Roman source.

In the earliest and perhaps most important of all his historical works, Dom Gasquet has given us an exhaustive and painstaking account, drawn from contemporary records and authorities of the suppression of the English monasteries. And here, even more than elsewhere, one is thankful for the calm historical style which, concealing nothing, recording everything, leaves no foothold whence a charge of special pleading can be brought against the author.

So scrupulously has Dom Gasquet carried out his principle of giving facts without comment, that but for the name on the title-page one would never suppose him to be a monk describing the persecution of his brethren and sisters in religion. The only note of passionate indignation in the whole book on "Henry VIII. and the Monasteries," occurs in passages quoted from the works of Mr. Blunt, an Anglican clergyman. There is no invective, little word painting, no anger and clamor, as the learned Benedictine speaks of the tyrant's heartless cruelties and unbridled extortions; it would almost seem as if Dom Gasquet held Ruskin's opinion that an adjective is bad English, and certainly he imitates St. Michael in refraining from "a railing accusation." Yet never was Henry's ungoverned character shown forth more powerfully than by this author's quiet and judicial marshalling of facts as contained in the records of the time; never was there a more scientifically accurate exposure of the motives of "Bluff Harry" when he

"Broke into the spence and turned the cowls adrift."

While admitting that the religious houses had not quite recovered their tone since the time of the Black Death, and that occasional scandals and lack of discipline existed, Dom Gasquet shows that grave immorality was the exception in both convents and monasteries, and that where it existed it was punished in the regular way by Superiors, and notified to the ordinary at his visitation.[1] This is only what common-sense would itself suggest. It is easier to do evil in the world than in the cloister, and in the world the

[1] Dom Gasquet thus sums up the extent of truth in the general charge of lax living so freely made against the religious of old time; "It would be affectation to suggest that the vast regular body in England was altogether free from grosser faults and immoralities. But it is unjust to regard them as existing to any but a very limited extent. . . . . The religious of the sixteenth century had passed through many difficulties dangerous to their spiritual no less than to their temporal welfare. Yet, while their moral tone had probably been lowered by the influence of the spirit of the times, the graver falls were certainly confined to individual cases. Anything like general immorality was altogether unknown among the religious of England. This much is clearly proved by the the testimony of the acts of episcopal visitations, as well as by the absence of any sweeping charge until it became necessary for Henry and his agents to blast the fair name of the monastic houses in order the more easily to obtain possession of their property."—*Henry VIII. and the Monasteries*, vol. i., p. 38.

evil-inclined as a rule would prefer to stay. Moreover, the nunneries were the chosen and valued places of education for girls of all classes, and it is impossible to believe that fathers, to the very worst of whom their daughters' innocence is the holiest thing on earth, would voluntarily send them to be brought up in schools of wickedness. The idea is too monstrous to be entertained. There can be no doubt that the description left to us by one who knew the convents of old England is a truer picture of their quietly-busy life, than any which the inflamed imaginations of writers who lived long after the Reformation[1] have painted; the regular hours, the school life carried on in the midst of the tranquil country scenes; the young maids brought up to imitate examples of piety, humility, modesty and obedience, "and taught needle-work, confectionery, writing, drawing"; the nuns and their boarders coming out in summer with their distaffs, to work in the meadow close by the house.

As to the abbeys and monasteries of men, the indignation of the people at their suppression is a sufficient proof that they were not abodes of corruption. Robert Ashe, the leader of the northern rising, gave as the popular reasons for objecting to the spoliation of the monks, their fair dealing with their tenants, whose rents they never raised or exacted under hard circumstances; their relief of the poor, their hospitality to man and beast, their useful public works, their faithful administration of money left in trust; and the people were the more exasperated against their enemies because the overthrow of the monasteries went hand in hand with attacks on Catholic doctrine and practice, especially devotion to our Lady and prayers for the dead. During the short-lived successes of the northern insurgents—before Henry, by false promises, had deluded them into laying down their arms—they everywhere reinstated the evicted monks. These people, gentlefolk and commoners, had the lives of the religious always before their eyes. They knew, too, how ill fitted were Cromwell's commissioners, men of a coarse and truculent type, to occupy themselves with the morals of monks and nuns. And one can only wonder at the power of ingrained prejudice and foregone conclusions when one finds even so generally correct a historian as Hallam repeating the parrot-cry against the religious, their pious "frauds," their "hypocritical austerities," their "extreme licentiousness, hardly concealed by the cowl of sanctity." "I know not," he says, "by what right we should disbelieve the reports of the visitation under Henry VIII., entering, as they do, into a multitude of specific charges both probable in their

[1] It has been well remarked that those who lived soon after the religious revolution, even though addressing a Protestant public, describe monks and nuns as of pure and venerable character, *e.g.*, Friar Laurence, in *Romeo and Juliet.*

nature and consonant to the unanimous opinion of the world."[1] To speak of the charges as "probable in their nature" is to misunderstand the whole scope of the monastic life and the evangelical counsels; while the world, as we have seen, was very far from unanimous in its opinion of the guilt of the monks. Hallam, no doubt, did not know so much as we know now of the evil repute of the visitors, Legh, Layton, Ap Rice and Loudon; but he did know what was the character of Henry VIII. himself, and how the parliament which gave him partial power over the monasteries was chosen by the king and not by the nation; how, moreover, even that parliament limited the dissolution to the poorer houses, so that many of the suppressions were acts of absolute illegality.

And what despair must have seized on the souls of the people, already groaning under intolerable taxation, when they saw the wealth of hospitable abbeys and venerated shrines carried off to the royal treasury, while their own burthen was not lessened by a penny, and the religious who had formerly relieved their distresses were driven forth, almost penniless, from the ancient abodes of Christian charity!

Of course, the schism and the robbery went together. Monasteries, such as alien priories, had been suppressed before, but always with the permission of the Sovereign Pontiffs, and on the understanding that their property should be put to other pious uses. And Clement VII., in his final efforts to retain Henry in the Church, had granted him leave to suppress small houses where there were no more than six inmates, who were to be placed in the larger abbeys. But compromise was of little use with a man like Henry, longing for unlimited treasure, unlimited matrimony, unlimited control of Church and state.

But of all the grievous things which happened at that grievous time, the most deplorable was the fall into schism, at a king's angry word, of the whole English episcopate with the one exception of the saint who ruled the diocese of Rochester. It was a catastrophe, a falling of stars from heaven, the possibility of which nowadays we can hardly conceive. Yet Dom Gasquet, with his usual moderation, and the capacity for putting himself in the place of those whose actions he discusses—which has certainly been very much wanting to Protestant historians—explains, without excusing, the attitude of mind which made such ruin possible. The Tudor despotism had accustomed Englishmen to look on the king as the fountain of authority, and even as "the proper guardian of the religious unity of England," which last appeared to them of "paramount importance." They imagined that such unity would be

[1] *Middle Ages*, vol. iii., p. 303.

secured by the royal headship, nor did they heed Fisher's warning, that "to fall out of the bark of St. Peter was to be drowned in the waters of sects and schisms." It appears that the conduct of the bishops is viewed in much the same light by the historian of Blessed John Fisher as by Dom Gasquet. "Owing," he writes, "to the false principles current since the great schism, to the want of deep theological studies at the universities, or to the contempt of ancient ways that then prevailed among the disciples of the Renaissance, the importance of the supremacy of the Holy See for the maintenance of unity was less felt than at former times in England . . . . In their exaggerated spirit of nationalism, the bishops thought it might be set aside and replaced by that of Catholic kings. The acts of the sovereigns of England, father, son, daughter, were the best practical refutation of these theories. . . . It must not be thought that I am excusing the conduct of the English bishops. I would merely observe that the question was not so clear to them as it is to us."[1]

And yet, granting all this, one cannot but feel surprised that they should have thought it possible to keep the Catholic faith intact under circumstances hitherto unknown in the Christian Church. Heresy was already treading close on the heels of schism, and had appeared even in the episcopal body itself. Latimer, of Worcester, Hilsey, who succeeded Blessed Fisher at Rochester, to say nothing of Cranmer, of Canterbury,[2] were known to be "of the new learning and holding many tenets of Luther and Tindal," and one of the requests of the northern insurgents was for the deprivation of these false pastors.[3] And yet bishops such as Tunstal and Gardiner, who retained the whole body of Catholic doctrine, could believe that the royal headship was a bond of unity, and urge Fisher to save his life by bowing down to Henry! The confessor and martyr, who seems also to have had the gift of prophecy, understood the laws of the spiritual world too clearly to be deceived. "What hope is left," he asked, "if we fall, that the rest shall stand? The fort is betrayed even of those that should have defended it! And, therefore, seeing the matter is thus begun, and so faintly resisted on our parts, I fear we be not the men that shall see the end of this misery."[4]

As it was with the bishops, so also with the secular priesthood. Of the heads of religious houses, also, many, in fear and misery and

---

[1] *Life of B. John Fisher*, pp. 324–5.

[2] *Henry VIII. and the Monasteries*, ii., p. 100. Against Cranmer it was objected by the "Pilgrims of Grace" "that he took upon him to make the divorce," and "had not his pall as his predecessor had."

[3] *Henry VIII. and the Monasteries*, ii., 99.

[4] *Life of B. John Fisher*, p. 336.

agony of conscience, took the oath of supremacy in the vain hope of propitiating the persecutor. Sometimes—not always—they saved their lives at the cost of forfeiting the martyr's crown which the Carthusians and Blessed Forest and his Franciscan brethren and many other true religious of the ancient Church of England now wear in heaven; but their houses and living were taken from them, and they were turned adrift without pity, without so much as barren honors.

Thus it is true that the Church of England, as a whole, fell; in the words of a section of modern ritualists, was "driven into schism." Unfortunately for their argument, the present Established Church happens not to be descended in any sense from that which was cut off from Catholic unity in the days of Henry VIII. It is this fact which, above all others, must be pointed out and insisted on, owing to the strange frame of mind in which most Anglicans live. They hardly shrink at all from the name of schism—only show that they are continuous in order and doctrine with the old English Church, and they are content. But plain history tells a very different tale. It proves that the modern Anglican body is not descended even from the schismatic church of Henry and Edward, and resembles it only in holding its temporalities and in being the pliant servant of the state.

Time passed, and the Supreme Head died. As the new Supreme Head was only nine years old, the supremacy practically went to his guardian and uncle, the Earl of Hertford and Duke of Somerset, who had imbibed Swiss and German Protestant doctrines, and proceeded to engraft them on the Church under his sway. Anglicanism had now entered on its second phase, a scene of indescribable, Babel-like confusion, of wrangling bishops, clashing opinions, new interpretations, hateful blasphemies; already England was overwhelmed by the "waters of sects and schisms" predicted by Bishop Fisher. During the reign of Henry VIII., Catholic practice had in great part prevailed, and was often enforced by him with the faggot; but a chain broken in one link is a chain which binds no longer, and the breach of continuity of doctrine really began when communion with the See of St. Peter ceased. With the death of the strong-willed and violent-tempered monarch, whom few dared to oppose, the remainder of the chain of Catholicity snapped into innumerable pieces. Henry had not been dead a month before Protestantism, as understood in Switzerland, began to speak officially from the English pulpit, and in the Chapel Royal itself the key-note was struck to which the State religion, in spite of many discords, generally attuned itself up to the days when Newman and Pusey arose.

In an exhaustive work on "Edward VI. and the Prayer-book,"

Dom Gasquet has painted for us in his usual austere coloring, without any touch of imagination or suspicion of exaggeration, the humiliating spectacle of the "Convocations" of Edward's reign. The "Comedy of Convocation" now is child's play compared with what it was at that disastrous time. Indeed it could not be called a comedy, for its horribly ludicrous elements, though they may have stirred the cynical mirth of the enemy of mankind, were fit to make angels weep. Catholic dogma was uprooted wholesale. It was no longer the headship of St. Peter that was in question, but doctrines and practices common to east and west, and which even schismatics had until then retained. The veneration of relics and images, the Lenten fast, the rites of ordination, even the Blessed Sacrament of the altar itself, most dear to the English heart, became the subjects of attack among the lords spiritual and temporal who followed Somerset's leading. The more Catholic-minded bishops, all for antiquity and law and order, found themselves unable to stay the black, angry waters of foreign Protestantism that came rushing in through the opened flood-gates—those flood-gates which only a central authority and universal teacher could keep closed. As to the inferior clergy, the antics indulged in by the broken-down friars and married clerics who had eagerly adopted the views of Latimer, Ridley, and Hilsey, might claim to have beaten the record in religious buffoonery. One need go no further than the pages of Strype, the Protestant historian of the Reformation, to judge how much of "decency and order" characterized the early days of the reign of private opinion in England.

In the height of this confusion, and while the King's Council issued contradictory proclamations about religion almost every other day, Somerset and Cranmer—who were blown about with every wind of doctrine, or rather every whim of the ruling powers—determined on securing uniformity of custom by means of a Book of Common Prayer. The Catholic Church, it is truly said, has unity of belief and a hundred prayer-books, while Anglicanism has one prayer-book and unlimited divergency of doctrine. Secure in the integrity of her faith, the Church can afford to countenance different forms of devotion and religious uses; even the ritual of the Mass may be allowed to vary in certain countries, since the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is everywhere the same.[1]

[1] "Local and diocesan usage of every sort," writes Dom Gasquet, "was swept away (by the new prayer-book), and an absolute uniformity prescribed for the whole realm—a thing unheard of in the ancient Catholic Church in England no less than in France and Germany."—*Edward VI. and the Prayer-book*, p. 2. The "Sarum rite," of which Ritualists talk so much, was one of the usages permitted by the Roman See, though differing from the use of Rome.

But legalized discord, for the sake of a semblance of cohesion, must need tie down its ministers to outward uniformity by means of a book, which it was supposed, would bind them all.

Over the framing of this book a battle royal ensued among the Bishops and King's Councillors. Cranmer and Ridley were at the head of the innovators; Tunstall, Gardiner and Heath at the head of the party which strove to retain Catholic doctrine in the new ritual. How entirely the Protestants, aided by the powers that were, prevailed, was made evident by the fact that Cranmer's new book was approved of by Calvin, to whom it was forwarded by Miles Coverdale just before his departure for England to take advantage of those halcyon times for fallen clerics.[1] The sermon was magnified into the central act of religious observance; the walls of St. Paul's and of our other ancient cathedrals, of which the very stones might well have cried out, heard for the first time a mutilated ambiguous office read instead of the Canon of the Mass, and saw the Communion given in both kinds. In vain the Catholic bishops, their eyes opened too late to the real meaning of a royal supremacy, had striven to retain a semblance of Catholicism for their broken Church. They were deprived of their sees and imprisoned, and the Prayer-book of 1549 was launched on an astonished and indignant nation. It was accompanied by a prohibition of "any alteration in the rites until the King should please to alter," and a hint that further "reformations" should follow in due time.

The reformations already attempted were quite enough to exasperate the English people. Discontent spread far and wide; Devon and Cornwall in the extreme west, Norfolk in the east, rose in rebellion against the new Prayer-book, declaring that they would have the holy decrees of their forefathers observed, kept and performed, and the Sacrament of the Altar restored to its ancient honor, and the Latin Mass as before. The government employed German troops to quell a people rising for the Faith. "The imposition of the book of the new service was only effected through the slaughter of many thousands of Englishmen by the English government, helped by their foreign mercenaries. The old dread days of the Pilgrimage of Grace returned, the same deceitful methods were employed to win success, the same ruthless bloodshed was allowed in the punishment of the vanquished. Terror was everywhere struck into the minds of the people by the

[1] Cranmer, at this time, professed to believe that the Mass was "only a memory and representation of the Sacrifice of Calvary." He dared not have said so in Henry's reign. Such contradictions had the rapid changes entailed, that a preacher licensed by Cranmer was fined by the mayor of a town, in virtue of a law then on the statute-book, for preaching against the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar.—*Edward VI.*, p. 128.

sight of the executions, fixed for the market days, of priests dangling from the steeples of their parish churches, of laymen set up in the high places of the towns."[1]

In the midst of this reign of confusion and terror the Protector, Somerset, followed to the block those earlier lay promoters of the Reformation, Anne Boleyn and Thomas Cromwell. Somerset was building his palace in the Strand with the spoils of desecrated churches, and his pre-Puritan Protestantism allowed him to keep his workmen at their task on Sundays, to the scandal of a Catholic people. At the apex of his greatness a cabal of nobles overthrew him, and he was executed at Tower Hill on January 22, 1552. But the Duke of Northumberland, now supreme, was as deeply interested in furthering the Reformation as his late rival, and this very year was marked by the introduction of the second Book of Common Prayer, which was even more distinctly Protestant than the first, and which, with the exception of a few alterations introduced by Elizabeth and Charles II., remains to this day.

When Mary came to the throne, the Catholic bishops, who had been deprived and imprisoned without so much as a show of legality for their opposition to the new doctrines, gladly made their peace with Rome, nor did they turn again with the weathercocks of political change. "The logic of facts was stronger than the logic of words."[2] The bishops had had enough of royal supremacy, and had seen how far such a rearrangement of the Christian scheme was likely to secure the religious unity of the nation. This tardy firmness of the English prelates brings us to the third phase of Anglicanism—the Elizabethan phase which we see slowly dissolving around us at this moment.

And here it is that a distinct breach, a chasm unbridged and profound, separates the modern established Anglican Church from the English Church of former ages. The Catholic bishops, with one accord, refused to hand over the succession to the fallen priest whom Elizabeth had nominated to the See of Canterbury. Even the timid Kitchin of Llandaff, after half assenting, held aloof at last. In the straits to which the government was reduced every law of the Christian Church and every shadow of rightful jurisdiction were set aside, and the ex-friar, Barlow, whose own consecration was more than doubtful, consecrated Parker with a mutilated ceremony, silently and almost secretly, in the darkness of a winter's morning. One undoubted bishop alone, Hodgskyn, was present as an assistant, and the queen undertook to supply all defects by her royal authority—a plenary papal act which ought to have been perfectly satisfactory to a body of men who openly professed their

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 254.

[2] *Life of Blessed John Fisher*, pp. 324–5.

contempt of the orders, for the want of which they were reproached by the world.

There was thus no more question of a schism, but only of a sect, akin to the sects of Luther and Calvin, but having less cohesion even than they. The doctrines of the new church were anything and anyhow. The articles were mainly Calvinistic, the rubrics and catechism a battle-ground on which Arminian and Zwinglian and Calvinist and Puseyite and latter-day Ritualists and anti-Ritualists of every shade might and would struggle and rend each other; and nowhere could any living central authority be found to pronounce *ex cathedra* on the meaning of the shifty Cranmer and his fellow-workers when they compiled their ambiguous book. Yet these very uncertainties raised Anglicans at last out of the depths of eighteenth century High Church dulness and Low Church bitterness to float on the sunny, changeful surface of modern ritualism. They seem but the sport of the waves, yet a rising tide, invisible and silent and mighty, rolls beneath. Borne on its unseen currents, numberless souls, themselves innocent of heresy and punished only for the sins of their forefathers, drift daily nearer and nearer to the rock of St. Peter, powerfully urged, almost in spite of themselves, into the safe shelter of the haven where they would be.

A. M. Grange.

ANCIENT KELTIC LITERATURE.

THE literature of any people is the manifold expression of its existence and development, of the longings and ideals, the struggles, failures, and vicissitudes which make up its history, from the first faint dawning of national consciousness down to the splendid flowering of all its germs of greatness. Literature and history go together; the savage has no literature because he has no history. With the growth of the latter goes hand in hand the development of the former; the richness and variety of one correspond to the fulness and exactness of the other. The age of Cæsar and Tacitus is the age of Virgil and Horace; Dante and Villani, the great mediæval chroniclers, and the singers of the immortal mediæval lays, were contemporary. Even the literature of our own day, so perfect in form, so correct in technique, so varied in its subject-matter, finds its counterpart in every branch and province of history—so closely allied are these two channels of human thought. Hence an account, however imperfect, of the treasures of the ancient Keltic literature, must needs begin with some preliminary notions of the origin and primitive movements of that race whose influence, direct and indirect, on the intellectual formation of the modern world is so much greater than is usually known.

I.

If one casts his eye on a map of modern Europe, he will see there great regions occupied by French, English, German, Spanish, Italian, and Slav populations. They have lived so long within their respective limits that they seem to us autocthonous. Nevertheless, in the third and fourth centuries before our era, not only the British isles in their entirety, but great tracts of central, western, and southwestern Europe, were inhabited by pure Keltic races. About 280 B.C., within fifty years of the death of Alexander the Great, while Carthage was yet powerful in Sicily, and Rome was slowly consolidating her hegemony over Italy, the Keltic tongue was spoken from the Atlantic to the Black Sea, from the Orkneys and Hebrides to the Adriatic. Its southern limits were everywhere conterminous with the Greek and the Etruscan. Not only the latter, but the Umbrian, Illyrian and Iberian were the languages of races subject to the Kelt, whose ancient idiom was the tongue of conquest and administration on the Danube and the Elbe, as on the Thames and the Seine, the Rhine, the Tagus and the Ebro. France and Belgium, Spain and Portu-

gal, Southern Germany, Switzerland and the upper half of Italy, Hungary, Bohemia, Bavaria, and long stretches of the lower Danubian lands, resounded simultaneously to those rich strains which are now dying off into the mysterious ocean from the western edges of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Brittany. Those vast districts were then the home of an ardent and warlike people, rudely pastoral and nomadic, noble barbarians of gigantic stature, fair-haired and blue-eyed, ever ready to quit the plains or the hill sides where they dwelt in circular huts of planks, covered with twisted and painted osier, and protected by great palisaded walls of earth or of huge Cyclopean stonework, such as may yet be seen in vast and rugged outline on the Menelstein at St. Odile, in the Alsatian Vosges, and elsewhere through the south German lands. In the pre-Christian times, these painted and tattooed warriors disputed the growing power of the Eternal City, and exterminated many a Roman legion on the plains of northern Italy or in the passes of the Alps. They swept into northern Greece from their seats on the Danube, and ravaged the Balkan peninsula, daring even to insult sacred Delphi itself. They captured and sacked Rome, and for seven months (390 B.C.) sat upon the Palatine, the expectant heirs of Roman greatness. *Vae Victis*, cried the Keltic Brann (the Brennus of Roman history) as he flung his sword on the scales where the frightened Roman was counting out his ransom at the end of that memorable siege. Never was hasty word more thoroughly rebuked, for after a few short centuries of brilliant victories and meteor-like development, the Kelt saw the fickle goddess quit his dragon banner and perch upon the eagles of his enemies. The gigantic tribesman had humbled the little Roman to the dust, but the great soul of the latter imbibed new life from the sacred soil of the Capitol, and he never rested until he had driven the Kelt to the very margin of the west, and shut up in a few mountainous islands the perpetual restless wanderer for whom hitherto the earth was all too small. But, ere that took place, the Kelts had yet a career of glory to run. We find them in the early part of the third century B.C. assailing the seaboard colonies of the Greeks in Asia Minor, and carving out for themselves a state in the heart of that country, high up on the table lands of Galatia, where their language, polity, and manners endured for seven centuries, withstanding the corrosive influence of Hellenic thought and the levelling spirit of Roman administration, yielding only to the mild doctrines of St. Paul, but still until the time of Justinian a Keltic speaking and living people.[1]

[1] The information which scholars have been able to glean from the geographers, historians, philosophers, and orators of antiquity, concerning the movements of the Kelts, is found collected in the first volume of Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens des*

Long ago, so long ago that there is no human record of the time, all these Keltic populations, so the modern men of science assure us, came into Europe from the Orient, being the first wave of the great human flood that rolled westward from the banks of the Oxus and the broad plateau of Bactriana, in Central Asia. They were the first men of Aryan race, followed, in time, by many others, whose descendants now speak the Greek, Latin, Germanic, Teutonic and Sclavonic tongues.[1] Of them we know little more than what I have just said. In the second century before Christ Teutonic tribes from beyond the Elbe drove them slowly to the Rhine and beyond it, into the foot-hills, forests and valleys of the Alpine regions. The Roman people penned them up from the other side of the mountains, and at the same time conquered Spain, where the Kelt, already mixed with the Iberian, soon melted away into the Hispano-Roman population. There remained to them yet, shortly before Our Lord's birth, the vast regions of Gaul, but the genius of Julius Cæsar and their own jealousy and degeneracy co-operated to make them lose their country and their independence. In an incredibly short time they were absorbed in Gaul, as in Spain, by the superior Roman state and culture, and became in time more Roman than the Romans themselves. It is true that it was only the Keltic political elements which were eliminated in this fierce struggle; the tongue, the manners, the habits, the spirit, and that certain compact substratum of feeling, experience, ideals, vague hopes and longings which is the solid concrete of all ancient nationalities, did not yield so easily to the impact of the imperial system and the Greek culture. The satirist Lucian shows us Keltic-speaking soothsayers in Asia Minor about the middle of the second century. His contemporary, St. Irenæus, complains that his Greek style suffers from long contact with the Keltic tongue and manners in the south of Gaul. Druidesses, though reduced in numbers and power, existed still in Gaul at the end of the third century as magicians and soothsayers, using the Keltic tongue. The civil laws of Rome recognized at the same time the

---

Gaules et de la France (Paris, 1869). Compare F. Robion, *Observations Critiques sur l'Archéologie dite Prèhistorique, spécialement en ce qui concerne la Race Celtique* (Paris, 1879); and A. Bertrand. *De la Valeur des Expressions* Κέλται, Γαλάται, Κελτικη, *et* Γαλατια, *dans Polybe* (Paris, 1875), and *Les Celtes, les Galates, et les Gaulois*, of M. d'Arbois de Jubainville, as well as the *Histoire des Gaulois* of Amédée Thierry. In the last numbers of the *Revue Celtique*, 1893-94 (xiv., 4; xv., 1), there is a very profound and scientific study by M. d'Arbois de Jubainville, entitled *Les Celtes en Espagne.*

[1] From the multitude of works written on this subject, I may cite *The Origin of the Aryan Race*, by Canon Taylor (*Contemporary Science Series*); Conten, *Die Wanderungen der Kelten;* De Villenorsy, *Origine des Premières Races d'Europe* (*Muséon*, 1894), and *Les Celtes* (in *La Science Sociale*, Paris, 1891).

validity of legal documents executed in Keltic.[1] There was serious resistance in but one little corner, Brittany, the land of the Veneti —the only ancient Kelts who ever had a navy. These clung unreservedly to the Keltic tongue and manners, and never fully submitted to the political yoke of Rome, while the frequent infusions of Keltic blood out of Wales and Cornwall from the end of the fourth to the end of the sixth century kept increasing the power and intensifying the spirit and the peculiar consciousness of the race in the dense forests and along the rocky sea-walls of this remotest corner of the Gaulish Keltland.

Thus, within two hundred years the Kelt who had sacked Rome, pillaged Hellas, and conquered in Asia Minor; who held the Rhine, the Danube and the fairest shores of the Mediterranean, had dwindled away in Europe, by some mysterious fate, before the Teuton and the Roman. Some names of rivers and mountains and towns, some huge forts and earth defences; some rude monuments, cromlechs, menhirs, dolmens, cairns and the like; a few inscriptions, some tumuli or cemeteries, with such relics as collars, brooches, clasps, chains and plaques of gold, battle-axes, chariots and swords, idols, pottery and ornaments; some hundreds of words preserved in French, Italian, Spanish and German, like flies in amber, are all that is left to us of this not inglorious period of the first civilizers of Europe. Even here they were teachers and transmitters, and in their long contact with the Etruscan and Greek civilizations they imbibed something from those artistic races, and were in this the first preceptors of the Teutonic peoples to the north and east as they were their earliest missionaries.[2]

---

[1] St. Irenæus, *Præfatio adv. Hæreses;* Digests, xxxiii., 11; Lampridius, Vita Alex. Severi, c. 53; Sulpicius Severus, in his life of Saint Martin of Tours. Compare Edelestand du Méril, in his *Origines de la Basse Latinité* (*Mélanges Archéologiques*, 1850). In his epigram, *De Mulabus Gallicis*, the fifth-century Claudian shows us the Keltic peasant of Gaul yet using his native tongue:

> "Miraris si voce feras pacaverit Orpheus,
> Cum pronas pecudes *gallica verba* regant,
> Barbaricos docili (mula) concipit aure sonos."

[2] Wakeman, *Handbook of Irish Antiquities* (Dublin, 1891); Lord Dunraven, *Notes on Irish Architecture* (London, 1875). In the *Revue Archéologique* for 1879, there is an interesting study by M. François von Pulszky, Director of the State Museums and Libraries of Hungary, on the *Monuments of the Keltic Rule in Hungary;* he concludes a detailed examination of the numerous Keltic objects preserved in Hungary, with these words: "The common tongue, the frequent alliances, commercial relations, and the knowledge of their common orgin (all of which lives as yet in the popular legends of the Kelts), suffice to explain the similarity of these objects, though found in widely-distant parts of central Europe. Their vicinity to the Etruscans, a much more artistic race than the Keltic, made them capable of imitating the products of Etruscan skill (brooches, bracelets, etc.), and on the other hand, of spreading such objects over the wide expanse of Keltic territory. The old Felsina of the Etruscans became the Keltic Bononia (Bologna), capital of the Boii (whence Bohemia, Bavaria),

The Kelt is the most persistent wanderer of the great human family, and this was his first exodus—vast, dim and mysterious—breaking over Europe like some dark tidal wave out of the deep Orient, engulfing nearly all traces of previous populations, only to be itself, in turn, swallowed up by those nations and peoples who come more easily within the ken of authentic history.

What was the literature of this heroic period of the Keltic race? We ignore it. "It was a time of vast and mysterious shadows, like the clouds heaped round the sun rising from the sea." In the Irish annals, besides poems and prophecies of vague, unintelligible import, and in the historic tales. there are strange stories of the origin of Partholonians and Fomorians, Firbolgs, Tuatha de Danaans and Milesians, in which Egypt, Greece, Norway and other lands play a great part. These are legendary—mythic, if you will—yet there is a tinge of the truthful about them, the perfumed breath of the Orient, the salt air of the sea, the souvenirs of long wanderings, the echoes of red battle and hotly-disputed invasion. It were as vain to try to reduce these wild, incoherent tales within the lines of history as to imprison the sweet zephyrs that come up from the flowery south or chain the vague fancies of dreamland.

> "*Theseus:* I never may believe
> These antique fables, nor these fairy toys.
>
> *Hippolyta:* But all the story of the night told over
> And all their minds transfigured so together,
> More witnesseth than fancy's images,
> And grows to something of great constancy,
> But, howsoever, strange and admirable."
>
> —*Midsummer Night's Dream,* Act V., Sc. I.

No doubt there was a large popular literature of battle-songs, the raw material of some glorious future epic, splendid tales and chants of rude but grand sublimity, chapters of history in which fact and legend were intertwined like the rugged headlands and their enshrouding mists on the wintry coasts of Kerry,—just such a *rudis indigestaque moles* of literature as a warlike, ardent, sensi-

---

a rich and civilized community, whence came the Etruscan vases, statuettes and tripods found in Germany, Gaul, and Hungary. . . . . The Kelts were an intelligent, quick-witted people, plastic beneath the civilizing influences of Etruscan, Greek, and Roman, whenever they met the latter as neighbors, mercenaries, or enemies. It is owing to them that a higher culture became known to their Teutonic neighbors of the north and the east; they were, without any doubt, the first preceptors of Teutonic barbarism." One may read with profit the account of the Etruscan discoveries at Marzabotto, near Bologna, published by Count Gozzadini, in 1871, when the peculiar Keltic brooches, swords, and spear-heads were found, together with objects of pure Etruscan origin. See De Mortillet, *Les Gaulois de Marzabotto*, in the *Revue Archéologique* for 1871.

tive and poetic race produces amid the scenes of untutored nature and during the hard training of war and wandering. The want of an alphabet and a fixed political régime has prevented all this from reaching us. Strange tales there surely were of the long journeys across the border lands of Asia and Europe; of the old Aryan fatherland; of battles, feuds and forays; of love and death and stirring adventure; of the sack of Rome, and the forcing of Thermopylæ; of the overthrow of the kings of Pergamos and the descendants of Alexander. What would we not give for some undeniable echoes of that tender, flexible, lyric tongue of the Kelts, while there was yet a vast though loose political unity among them, when they went wildly conquering on the Danube and the Ebro, in the happy climes of Spain and Italy, or on the classic soil of Greece, and the islands of the midland seas, perhaps with great Carthage herself, who was wont to hire their bands as mercenary soldiers? If we have no literature or domestic art of theirs out of this period, we have some of the noblest Greek sculpture which owes its origin to the struggles of the Hellene to save himself from Keltic rule. The Dying Gladiator is a Keltic warrior, the noblest trophy of the cultured Greek, the highest revenge of the Rhodian sculptor. The Apollo Belvidere of the Vatican is a replica of a famous statue ordered by the king of Pergamos, very probably to commemorate the victory of 278 B.C. over the Kelts, by which they were prevented from seizing on all the Greek colonies of Asia Minor, and driven to found a separate state on the high plateau of the interior. All else has perished, unless some future philologian can unearth the ancient language of the Galatians from the Turkish patois of the highest table-land of Asia Minor, where good-enough Irish was spoken until the time of St. Jerome.[1]

The Druids of Gaul who had come out of Ireland, Man and Britain were, it is true, a learned corporation, with notions concerning immortality and the future life that greatly impressed the Greek and Roman men of letters. They had schools on hilltops, in remote valleys and in the depths of forests in which thousands of the noblest youths studied. They had a knowledge of astronomy, mathematics, physics, medicine and geometry. They were the theologians, the sacrificers, the keepers of the magic and augural sciences, the counsellors of the nobility, the criminal judges, excommunicators, and the grand-electors. They were a monotheistic priesthood, a close religious corporation, which needed to

[1] "The people of Galatia have almost the same language as those of Trier."—*Ep. ad Galata*, praef. In his youth, St. Jerome had spent some time among the Gallo-Romans, and was capable of comparing the Keltic with the tongue of the Galatians. In a still later writer (Stephen of Byzantium) we find a similar assertion.

have its vast science handed down by memory, and whose literature, profane and religious, must have been enormous. But as they stood in the way of Roman centralization and absolutism, the Roman state broke up their control, degraded and banished them back to Ireland and Britain whence they had come. The bards remained, with their songs and tales, their elegant elegies and their cutting satires. They sang to the Keltic harp up and down the Roman roads of Gaul, but they were of another day and culture. They, too, disappeared, like the Druids, before the compact and organized literature, the more systematic schools, and the higher culture of the Greek and the Greco-Roman.[1] The Kelt of Gaul became an integral part of the Roman state, and, being like all Kelts of a plastic and receptive nature, continued to perfect his agriculture and mining, his skill in ornamentation of chains and shields and swords. He made better roads and bridges. He did more trading in exports and imports, sending out his soaps, pipes and perfumes, his cloaks, mantles and trousers, his coral, tapestries and dyes, and bringing in furniture, ivory, books, jewels, paintings, cunning carvings, tissues and brocades, spices and rare meats, Roman newspapers and imperial gossip, until he became the most cultured and the least warlike subject of the Eternal City and eventually took up the care of her immortal literature on the day when he had lost all memory of his own.[2]

II.

The extinction or absorption of the continental Kelts by the Teutonic tribes and the Roman system did not close the career of the race in history and literature. Its shrunken and diminished elements took refuge in the British Islands, the westernmost edge of the European world, where, until this day, they have maintained a fierce, unequal struggle for existence against pitiless human foes, and a certain dark relentless fate whose shadow seems to be ever heavier upon this people, turning its existence into one long dra-

---

[1] The Druids have been the object of many valuable studies. The Benedictine *Religion des Gaulois, Tiré des Plus Pures Sources de l'Antiquité* (Paris, 1727), contains the ancient authorities. Compare Otto Deuk, *Geschichte des Gallo-Fraenkischen Unterrichts*, c. 1, Die Gallo-druidesche Zeit. (Mainz, 1892). The Irish Druidism is best examined in O'Currey, *The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish* (Lectures ix.–x.), (London, 1873); and by d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Le Druidisme Irlandais*, and his *Cours de Littérature Celtique*, vol. 1; that of Britain, by Professor Rhys, in his *Celtic Britain*, c. ii. (London, 1884). On its disappearance from the Continent, see Fustel de Coulanges, *Institutions Politiques de l'Ancienne France*, pp. 110–119; and de Jubainville, in the *Revue Celtique*, 1891 (xii, 3), p. 316. In a rather extravagant book, entitled *Les Gaudes Legendes de France* (Paris, 1892), by Edmond Schuré, there is much of the popular Breton legend concerning the Druids of antiquity.

[2] De Belloguet, *La Civilisation des Gaulois* (Paris, 1868).

matic wandering from the uttermost Orient to the last limits of the West.

The main outlines of the history of the Keltic race in the British Islands are too well known to need repetition, and I therefore proceed to treat of its literature in this second period. The Keltic tribes of these islands are divided generally, as far as language and literature are concerned, into two great families, the Irish and the British, which are both descended from one more ancient common Keltic idiom. The British includes those dialects of the language spoken in what is now called England, *i.e.*, in Wales and Cornwall, or in Brittany. The Irish comprises the Manx, spoken in the Isle of Man, the Gaelic of the Scotch Highlands and the Erse or Irish proper. All of these dialects are substantially the same, and the differences are such as can easily be accounted for by well-known rules of Keltic philology. Though rapidly disappearing, and apparently doomed to extinction, they are all spoken as yet, except the Cornish, which died out in the last century. In round numbers there are perhaps in the world one million and a quarter of people who speak Keltic only, and three millions and a quarter who use it as their mother tongue, besides a growing handful of scholars in Germany, France, Italy, and the British Islands, who have taken up its study ere it disappears from human society where once it played so varied a rôle. It has a literature in all six dialects. The Cornish literature is the poorest of all, consisting of a few miracle plays, some songs and proverbs, a very old glossary of the twelfth century, and the story of the Passion of Our Lord in two hundred and fifty-nine stanzas or quatrains.

The Breton or Armoric has left us no relic of the old form of its literature, and out of the early Middle Ages we have in manuscript only two miracle plays, a life of a saint, a prayer-book and a dictionary. Mysteries, miracle plays, and popular songs, which surely embody an earlier epoch of the intellectual life of the Armoric or Breton people, compose their later literature. The Manx, which will soon be as extinct as the Cornish, has no ancient literature, though, in the days of Saint Patrick, the language was absolutely identical with the Irish, and to-day the pronunciation is quite similar, though there are many differences in orthography. The literature of the Highland Gaelic is chiefly composed of popular songs, ballads and tales, which must represent the rugged ancestral spirit and feelings of the mountain clans, but are of modern collection and little historic interest. There is said to be in it an undercurrent of the old Pictish, itself a Keltic dialect. The first missionaries, and later on the singers and musicians of Scotland were Irish, either by birth or training; therefore, if there were any old literature of Alba, it would be Irish in character. The Ossian of Mac-

Pherson is Gaelic in matter, but the form is a coarse forgery—the dress is that of an eighteenth century English classic, and though it is a noble production, one needs only to compare it with the accessible translations of the "Tain-Bó-Cualgne" and the "Colloquy of the Ancients" to see how wanting it is in certain inimitable Keltic tricks of style. There are songs and tales of a time previous to the Reformation in the Gaelic "Book of the Dean of Lismore," but that religious revolution reduced Gaelic to a peasant's patois, and substituted English influences on all the higher political and social life of the great chiefs.[1] The oldest specimen of the Highland Gaelic is contained in the ninth century manuscript known as the "Book of Dier," and is almost identical with the written Irish of that period.[2]

Thus, of all the dialects into which the old Keltic tongue has crystallized in time, there remain but two, the Irish and the Welsh, which possess an ancient literature. The manuscript collection of Welsh literature is abundant. Beside the volumes owned by the British Museum and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, there are 400 volumes in the Hengwrt collection now owned by a private gentleman of Wales. In general, the Welsh literature may be said to begin with the famous Gildas, a monk of the sixth century, whose "Lament on the Fall of Britain" is one of the best known of the early mediæval Latin works. In the ninth century, a certain Welsh cleric named Nennius wrote a short Latin account of the Saxon kings of England, including the mission of Saint Germanus, and the legends of Saint Patrick. It was based upon an earlier compilation, and was itself the framework of later chronicles, known as the Annales Cambriæ. In the twelfth century, Geoffrey of Monmouth produced from Welsh materials a very legendary compilation called the "Historia Britonum," in which figure the British legends of the colonization of Great Britain, the exploits of the shadowy King Arthur, and the birth and prophecies of the Druid Merlin. It was followed by vernacular chronicles or *Bruts*, in which the colonization of Britain is traced back to a fabulous Brutus, and by mechanical compositions known as *Triads*, in which various events, similar subjects, etc., are set down in stanzas of three verses, a composition peculiar to Wales.

The poetry of Wales is very extensive, and some of it very ancient. If we believe the critics and the savants of Wales, the poems of Taliessin, Aneurin, Merlin, and Llywarch Hen are of the fifth century or but little later. Their present form is said to be not older than the eleventh century, but that would not prevent the substance from being of a more remote date. In their older

[1] W. K. O'Sullivan, art. "Celtic Literature," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

[2] Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, vol. ii., 458.

forms they sing the wars of the Brython with the Romans, the Saxons, and the Scots or Irish. Frequently they are of a mystic or convivial cast, proverbial, satirical, or elegiac, and marked by much poetic feeling, complicated metres, gay humor, love of nature, and delicate appreciation of the female character. At the end of the eleventh century, influences from Brittany and Ireland made themselves felt in Welsh poetry, and gave to Welsh literature in general a strong and beneficial impulse. The Welsh poems of the period from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries are full of natural beauty and of keen and accurate observation of the external world. The wild woodland, the flowers, the song-birds, all the objective phenomena of nature are correctly noted and reproduced—in fact, love and nature, and not war, furnish the burden of their later song. Every household of importance had its bards and singers and story-tellers. To the latter we owe the famous "Mabinogion" or prose-tales of Wales, in which we are told that we ought to see the origins of mediæval chivalry, though many of its distinctive elements are found in the much earlier cycles of Irish heroic and romantic tales. Nevertheless, the "Mabinogion" are exquisitely beautiful stories of romantic and knightly adventure, drawn partly from the ancient Irish tales and partly from the Arthurian cycle. Such tales were always current in Wales and Ireland, but in the former country they became, at an early date, the property of the Norman story-tellers and clerics, after having passed through the crucible of the Breton imagination, and were thus worked up into the admirable stories of chivalry which later on fired the souls of European knights, and were told and retold at countless continental firesides pretty much as we now read them in Spenser, Ariosto, or Tennyson.

King Arthur himself is, in all probability, only the glorified Cormac Mac Art of Irish history, but such as the bards of Brittany and Wales have made him—the ideal of Keltic manhood and ambition. Merlin and Vivian, Enid and Gereint, and all the magical and high romantic machinery of the "Idylls of the King" are, in substance, from the old Keltic tales and songs, such as they have come down to us from Gael and Breton, from Welsh bards and Norman jongleurs; well-bred and elegant literature to-day, but at the bottom solidly Keltic, odorous with a thousand scents of that far, mystic, blissful land where the apple trees bloom forever, and the flowers, like men, are immortal; where fair women and brave men live on in undiminished youth, revelling in unsuspecting innocence; where no note of pain or sorrow breaks the great harmony of sound and color and feeling; where life is one long laughing childhood, and man and nature are but two aspects of the eternally good and beautiful.

Nay, more, this refined and delicate poetry, the tender roseate blush of purest Keltic sentiment, passed into channels by which it one day reached the mind of Shakespeare, and was by him given proper setting in *King Lear*, the *Tempest*, and the *Midsummer Night's Dream*. But the Welsh literature is in itself a large subject, and deserves a separate and circumstantial treatment.[1]

III.

The ancient Irish literature is incomparably the most important that the Kelt ever produced. Its age, the purity of the dialect, its high technical perfection, the abundance of its monuments, the vicissitudes of the race, the unbroken literary production of centuries, the imprint of Christian feeling and classic sentiment, the intrinsic beauty of its poetry and romance, the faint but clear and numerous threads which connect it with the pre-Christian and heroic age of the race, and thus with its cradle in the mysterious Orient—all these motives and many others are like so many sweet voices enticing us to enter a pleasant land, once resonant with music, eloquence, and song, but o'er whose cities and champaigns the night of forgetfulness and neglect has long since fallen, whose noble monuments are choked with dust, whose ports and markets no longer echo to the hum of commerce, and on whose annals there falls but an occasional white ray when some curious antiquarian opens their splended folios "to point a moral or adorn a tale."

The Irish literature was a complete and rounded *corpus*, when the Icelandic, the oldest vernacular literature of continental Europe began. In its old age it formed the men who wrote down the Eddas and the Sagas. The Irish teachers of the rude Angles of Northumbria were skilled men of letters, with minds filled with history, poetry and philosophy, humble saints but rare versifiers, sweet singers, plausible talkers. Between a song and a joke they infused the faith where the classic Roman failed. They are the nurses of English verse, and if we leave aside Beowulf and the few fragments that have drifted down the ages from old Saxony,—

---

[1] Stephens, *The Literature of the Kymry* (Llandovery, 1849); *Archeologia Cambrensis* (since 1846); *An Essay on the Influence of Welsh Traditions upon the Literature of Germany, France, and Scandinavia* (Llandovery, 1841); D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Cours de Littérature Celtique*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1883–92), especially vols. iii., iv. "From an intellectual point of view," says M. de Jubainville, "the *Ancient Laws of Wales* are the greatest glory of the Welsh. The eminent German jurisconsult, Ferdinand Walter, was of opinion that they surpassed, in this respect, all the mediæval peoples, so precise and refined does the national mind appear in this legislation, and so great was their aptness for philosophic speculation." Cf. also, Skene, *The Four Ancient Books of Wales*, containing the Kymric poems attributed to the bards of the sixth century (Edinburgh, 1868, 2 vols.).

Ceadmon and Bede and Aldhelm, Alfred and Aelfric, and the fragmentary English epics of earliest date, were directly or indirectly produced on this Northumbrian soil and owe much to the influence of their Irish teachers, not to speak of the multitudes of Anglo-Saxons who spent long years in Ireland, between the sixth and eighth centuries, and whose thought and speech must have become in great measure Kelticised. All this went on while the English language and literature were, so to speak, in the period of gestation. The English literature of the early middle ages is highly esteemed,—yet it cannot begin to compare with the remnants we possess of the Irish literature, either in variety, mass[1] or intrinsic value.

The literature of the Irish people extends nominally over a period of about two thousand years, and with absolute certitude goes back from one thousand to twelve hundred years. I do not intend to speak of the Latin literature produced by the Irish Kelts. It is a very respectable body of writings, beginning with the letters of Celestius in the fourth century, and the poems of Sedulius in the fifth, not to speak of St. Patrick's own works, and including such names as Columbanus, Gallus, Cummian, Adamnan, Sedulius of Liège, Dicuil, John Erigena, Hibernicus Exul, Dungal, the Irish grammarians, philosophers and teachers at the court and in the palace school of Charlemagne. Men like Elias of Angoulême and Manno, Marcus and Marcellus of St. Gall, Virgil of Salzburg, the "Irish Egyptians" of Alcuin, and the Scotellus of Theodulf of Orleans, were excellent Latin scholars. Moral theology, Latin grammar, the text of the Latin Vulgate, the early mediæval annals, church music, the studies of Greek, mathematics, geometry and astronomy, the vernacular tongues of Europe, especially the

[1] The numerous influences of the old Irish teachers upon the origin and formation of the Anglo-Saxon literature, might form the first chapter of a work of surpassing interest, which awaits the proper time and man, viz., the Influence of the Keltic Thought and Speech upon the Life and Letters of the English People. There are many hints and suggestions scattered through the *English Literature* of Ten Brink; the *Development of Early English Thought*, by Brother Azarias; the *History of Early English Literature*, by Mr. Stopford Brooke; the *Essay on Celtic Literature*, by Mr. Matthew Arnold, and the *Anglo Saxon Britain*, of Mr. Grant Allen. Mr. F. Y. Powell, the learned English editor of the *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, is of opinion that the finest gems of Icelandic poetry, those in which are most visible the qualities of high imagination, deep pathos, fresh love of nature, passionate dramatic power, and noble simplicity of language, are of Irish origin—the intermediary being the Scandinavian element settled in Ireland, and which by commerce, travel, and intermarriage acquired a great deal of the spirit and culture of their neighbors. "That the form (of the Sagas) was so perfect," he says, "must be attributed to Irish influence, without which indeed, there would have been a saga, but not the same saga. It is to the west that the Sagas belong; it is to the west that nearly every classic writer whose name we know belongs; and it is precisely in the west that the admixture of Irish blood is greatest."—"Icelandic Literature," in *Encyclopædia Britannica.*

Gothic and the Old High German, philosophy and travel, above all, the study of the Scriptures, the art of writing, and the noble science of pedagogics, owe much to the multitude of Irish monks and scholars who overflowed Central and Western Europe from the sixth to the twelfth century. I will not speak of the bishoprics they filled, nor the abbeys they founded, nor the severe and upright lives they led, nor their exhortations and discourses,—though in all these they were ever sublime teachers. I will only refer *en passant* to the numerous schools which this nation kept open in the heart of Europe, like crystal pools where the weary and the thirsty might always drink. Bobbio, Luxeuil, St. Gall, Waulsort, Metz, Reichenau, Milan, Laon, Cologne, Liège, to mention but a few of the places where they taught habitually and for a long time. The literary activity of the Irish race on the European continent is too large a theme for incidental reference. A very big volume would scarcely do it justice. I exclude therefore the Latin literature of the Irish, whether produced at home or abroad, and even those fragments of their Irish literature written abroad,—the famous glosses out of which the Old Irish has been reconstructed by Zeuss.[1]

Where is the ancient Irish literature found? The greater part of it is found to-day in Dublin, in the libraries of Trinity College and the Royal Irish Academy. A considerable share exists in the British Museum and in the Bodleian library at Oxford. There are between one and two hundred manuscripts, which pertain to this literature scattered in some thirty-two libraries of Europe, Rome, Brussels, Paris, St. Gall, Berne, Wurzburg, Carlsruhe, Cambrai, etc. In all there are perhaps two thousand manu-

[1] Zeuss, *Grammatica Celtica* (2d Ed.), 1870. There are more than 16,000 of these Irish glosses, over one-half of which are taken from a single book in the Ambrosiana at Milan, the *Liber Sancti Columbani de Bobbio*. By this one may judge of the richness of the tongue, when the glosses to a single Psalter could furnish over 8000 words. In fact, out of these glosses a grammar, dictionary and philology were reconstructed, and the darkness of early Keltic history rolled back considerably.

The labors of the mediæval Irish on the continent are reviewed in detail in Lanigan's *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* and in the volumes of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*. Bellesheim's *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Irland* (vol. i.) contains much useful matter on this subject which has never been exhaustively studied. *Cf.* also Bishop Healy's *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* (Dublin, 1890); Zimmer, *The Irish Element in Mediæval Culture;* Walter Schultze, *Die Bedeutung der iro schottischen Moenche fuer die Erhaltung und Fortpflanzung der mittelalterlichen Wissenschaft* (*Centralblatt fuer Bibliothekswesen*, Leipsic, 1889); Greith, *Die alt-irische Kirche* (Freiburg, 1867); Grupp, *Culturgeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. i. (Stuttgart, 1894). It seems strange that the numerous modern histories of pedagogics pay so little attention to this remarkable body of men who were the teachers of Frank, Burgundian and Aleman; whose copies of the classics are often the oldest and most precious, and who, almost alone, knew Greek in the west in the eighth and ninth centuries.

scripts or individual pieces, of which nineteenth-twentieths are yet unpublished. Dublin manuscripts would form a printed mass of about one thousand octavo volumes of original text alone. The publications of the Master of the Rolls in England, with notes and prefaces, do not yet reach three hundred volumes. The unprinted *corpus* of Irish literature far surpasses the mediæval Greek and Latin writers in Migne. The historical collections of Pertz and Bouquet are each far inferior to it. It is a stupendous mass of literature, a *mare magnum* into which whoever dives brings up a pearl, an inexhaustible mine wherein the poet and the philosopher, the historian and the artist, the philologian, the folk-lorist and the lawyer, the observer of ancient manners, and the student of institutions, may wander at will, and find each the treasures on which his heart is set. Yet it is the sad poor remnant of a literature, which has had more enemies for a longer time than any known literature on earth, and which is to-day neglected and forgotten as those

> "drenched sands
> On which a great soul's wealth lies all in heaps
> Like a wrecked argosy."

The Danes tore and burned the books of old, well-established schools on every river and estuary of Ireland; they *drowned* them, in the picturesque language of the contemporary annalists, a phrase which hints at their great number and confirms their utter destruction. None of them ever turn up at Copenhagen or Stockholm. The Norman invasion cut short in many places the peculiar Irish custom of transcribing into miscellaneous books the most valuable and typical examples of their literature. The impoverishment, exile and destruction of the natives robbed the books of their natural producers and protectors. The internal decay of the land reached the highest point at the time of the Renaissance when the genius of less ancient and flexible continental tongues bloomed out into that varied and elegant literature which will charm forever the ear and heart of all lovers of the truly refined and spiritual in the art of words.

The art of printing was discovered at a time when the Irish were in no condition to profit by it for the development of their national tongue, and even those who loved it most and knew it best began to use the easily procurable Latin books, where once the Keltic manuscripts were used. We might add the ordinary causes which affected the preservation of every literature previous to the era of the printed book—neglect, war, fire, periods of ignorance, pestilence, the strong hungry tooth of time, and that most dangerous of all, the cold contempt of those who stood by and saw their

nation's literature perish as a thing of no account. Every conceivable adverse influence has been ranged against these poor Irish books, yet a multitude of them has escaped. They came down in families of hereditary teachers; they were preserved by a few chiefs in their native fortresses; the people sheltered them in their cabins; they were smuggled over to the continent; the priest or the friar carried them on his back during his journeys or flights; they were hidden in inaccessible spots; in fact, they emerged into this century pretty much as the Irish Kelt himself, badly battered, but holding still the secret of eternal rejuvenescence. Yet we have to regret the loss of many books which reached uninjured our modern days. There are over thirty large collections known, whence several of the extant Irish manuscripts were copied, and which have disappeared, some of them since the beginning of the seventeenth century. An example will show how this literature was saved. For centuries there was preserved in the family of the MacEgans, of Tipperary, half-farmers, half-poets, an ancient volume of yellow parchment. In the last century this came to the knowledge of Edmund Burke, himself no Keltic scholar, but devoted to the glories of his country. The MSS. was purchased for a few pounds, and shortly the world knew that the Brehon Laws had been recovered, a body of ancient Keltic legislation, larger, more minute and perfect than anything of its kind except the civil law of Rome. This book is written in Archaic Irish, which is like a foreign tongue to the modern Kelt. It is only by piecemeal, and with the aid of the many thousand glosses dug out of other old manuscripts in which the ancient scribes inserted them, that a slow translation can be made. To preserve that book the family of the MacEgans risked their lives and their property, and passed, perhaps, as the very spawn of barbarism, though they held in their possession by right of ancient transcription, intelligence and ownership the volume which brings us nearest to the manners and customs of those Oriental forefathers from whom we have descended.[1]

The mediæval Irish preserved their literature in the monasteries and churches, as did all of the mediæval peoples, and by that channel much has come down to us. But they had a literary habit peculiar to themselves. The great chiefs and the principal bards, as well as the heads of certain learned professions were wont to keep large miscellaneous volumes of folio size, in which were transcribed specimens of such literature as best pleased or most interested them. It is thus that families of Brehons and physicians have handed down the "Senchus Môr," the "Book of

[1] William O'Brien, "The Irish Age of Gold," in *Irish Ideas*, Longmans, 1893.

Achill," the "Book of Rights," and other legal works, or the treatises of Galen and Hippocrates, together with much practical lore communicated orally. The chiefs and bards were mostly interested in tales, poems, annals and genealogies. Naturally, the books kept by them are filled with just such literature as could charm a simple people, proud of its antiquity and the purity of its descent, and given over to the pursuit of war or agriculture. We possess yet a number of these miscellaneous works, in which the poets or sennachies of the chiefs entered their loveliest tales and poems or consigned the annals of their county or their country; thus there is the "Book of the Dun Cow," the "Speckled Book," the "Book of Leinster," the "Book of Lecan," the "Yellow Book of Lecan,"[1] etc. Profane and ecclesiastical materials, history and legend, pagan and Christian matters, are mixed indiscriminately in these great books, some of which have several hundred folio leaves, and in all of which the writing is of excellent quality; for in ancient Ireland the poet was a good penman, as the musician was always a good singer. These manuscripts are frequently written on fine vellum, sometimes on paper. If I were to resume roughly their contents, before giving a detailed view of the old Irish literature, I would say that they contained grammars and glossaries; annals, genealogies, topographies (local geographies); pedigrees of saints and chiefs; mythologies and imaginative tales; lyric poetry, satires and elegies; treatises on mathematics, law and medicine; lives of Irish saints and synchronisms of Irish events with continental ones; romantic tales, adventures at sea, forays at home; market reports, ballads and humorous stories; dainty love songs and pretty fairy tales. Of course, the contents of these manuscripts are always as old as the manuscripts themselves, and often much older; their very form sometimes betrays them, being so archaic and difficult that they cannot be read without glosses and great patience.

Since the death of Eugene O'Curry, no one knows fully and precisely what the old Irish literature contains. For the only detailed description of it we are reduced to his "Lectures on the Manuscript Materials of Irish History," the chief source of the knowledge we possess on this subject. Edward O'Reilly published early in this century an incomplete catalogue of writers of Irish literature, which includes about 370 names (368), but it is scarcely more than a dry enumeration of authors and titles, while

[1] Photo-lithographic fac-similes of several of these great compilations have been published by the Royal Irish Academy, *e. g.*, the *Book of Ballymote* (fourteenth century), the *Book of Leinster* (twelfth century), the *Leabar na h Uidhre* (Book of the Dun Cow (about 1100 A.D.); the *Leabar Brac* or Speckled Book (fourteenth century).

the work of O'Curry is a monument to the genius of the most modest of scholars, and the most widely read of all Keltologists.[1]

IV.

It would be impossible within the assigned limits to give an adequate view of the entire body of Keltic literature which has reached us. I will therefore content myself with a conspectus of the *Historical Literature* of the Kelts, as presented in the ancient Irish manuscripts, premising first, that the following pages are by no means exhaustive, and aim only at conveying a general but accurate notion of the wealth of the old historical literature of the race; and second, that I purposely leave out the purely ecclesiastical histories and biographies, intending only to emphasize the profane culture of the Keltic writers. It may be roughly divided into Annals, Genealogies and Pedigrees, and Historical Tales.

I. *Annals.*—The oldest of the annals known to the early Irish Christian seems to have been the lost *Saltair of Tara*, which, according to an Irish poet of the eleventh century, is "the best summary

[1] *A Chronological Account of Nearly Four Hundred Irish Writers*, commencing with the earliest account of Irish history, and carried down to the year of Our Lord 1730; with a descriptive catalogue of such of their works as are still extant in verse or prose, consisting of upwards of one thousand separate tracts. By Edward O'Reilly, Esq. Dublin, 1820. (Vol. i. of the *Transactions of the Hiberno-Celtic Society.*) The great work of O'Curry is *Lectures on the Manuscript Materials of Ancient Irish History*, delivered at the Catholic University of Ireland during the sessions of 1855 and 1856. By Eugene O'Curry, M.R.I.A. Dublin, 1873 (re-issue). It consists of twenty-one lectures, which treat fully, for the first time, of the lost books ("The Cuilmenn," "The Saltairs of Tara and Cashel, "The Book of Ua Chongbhail, "The Cin Droma Snechta, etc.); the earliest existing manuscripts; the early historical writers and ancient annals; the Four Masters; the genealogies and pedigrees; the historic and imaginative tales; the remains of the early Christian period; the early ecclesiastical manuscripts; the so-called "prophecies," and the true way to write the history of Erin. One hundred and fifty-seven appendices give as many specimens of old Keltic literature. A series of fac-similes of ancient Keltic handwriting completes this book, which is almost without a parallel in the list of literary manuals, considering the peculiar circumstances of its growth and production. Of Eugene O'Curry might well be said what was written of John O'Donovan:

> Too few, too few, among our great,
> In Camp or Cloister, Church or State,
> Wrought as he wrought;
> Too few, of all the brave we trace
> Among the champions of our race,
> Gave us his thought.
>
> He toiled to make our story stand,
> As from time's reverent, runic hand
> It came, unchecked
> By fancies false; erect, alone,
> The monumental Arctic stone
> Of ages wrecked.
>
> —D'Arcy McGee, *The Dead Antiquary.*

of history, . . . with the synchronisms and chronologies" of all the kings of Ireland. It is supposed to have been composed in the third century, under king Cormac Mac Art, and indeed by him. The most valuable of the ancient extant annals are said to be those of Tighernach (Tierney O'Brien), abbot of Clonmacnoise and Roscommon, who died in 1088.[1] If we except the Saxon Chronicle, he is the most ancient vernacular chronicler of the northern nations, since Nestor, the father of Russian history, died in 1113 Snorro, the father of Icelandic history, did not appear for another century; Kadlubec, the first historian of Poland, died in 1223, and Stierman could not discover a scrap of writing in all Sweden older than 1159. The other northern chronicles of Gildas, Bede and Nennius, are in Latin, and do not come under our consideration. This ancient annalist relates the history of Ireland from about three hundred years B.C. to 1088, the year of his death. It is in Gaelic, with Latin and Greek citations, and argues a critical and judicious mind. It is clear, from his book, that the old abbot of Clonmacnoise was a man of erudition, for he cites Josephus, Eusebius, Orosius, Julius Africanus, the venerable Bede, St. Jerome, and many others; endeavors to reconcile their conflicting testimonies; collates the Hebrew text with the Septuagint, etc. There is no complete text of these precious ancient annals—we have only fragments, eight or nine in all, of varying length and value. We may recall here that Clonmacnoise was a famous school three hundred years before Tighernach lived, and that its then master, the wise Colchu, was saluted by Alcuin as his father and preceptor.[2]

In the same eleventh century lived Flann of Monasterboice, in Louth, a layman, writer of "Historical Synchronisms," and greatly respected by the learned Ussher, Ware, Lynch, O'Flaherty, and O'Conor, *i.e.*, by the great lights of Irish historical science. These synchronisms are parallel lines of Oriental and Roman rulers, whose reigns are made to tally with those of the kings of Erin, down to A.D. 718; from the time of Julius Cæsar their reigns are paralleled in series of one hundred years. A contemporary of Flann, was *Gilla Gaemhain* (Kevin), whose long chronological poem down to the middle of the eleventh century, and whose translation and continuation of the Welsh Nennius are known to the learned

[1] Printed in vol. i. of O'Conor, *Rerum Hibernicorum Scriptores*. 4 vols. Buckingham, 1814.

[2] Alcuini Epistolæ, in *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum*, vol. vi, p. 166, Ep. 14. This Colchu was the author (according to Colgan, *Acta SS. Hib.*, p. 378) of a collection of most ardent prayers, a work full of the warmest and most stirring devotion to God. The work called the *Scopa Devotionis, or Besom of Devotion* (Scuaip-Chrabhaidh) was still extant in the first half of the sixteenth century.—*Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. i., p. 595.

world as historical documents of much importance.[1] These synchronistic annals are at least of equal value with those of any mediæval European nation. It must have taken learning and devotion to parallel, synchronize and correct long lines of foreign rulers and events, for which the compilers had to possess foreign sources and authorities of some kind. They are, like all old European annals, vague, unreliable in the parts remote from their own day, but extremely trustworthy on events that come within their own purview. I may quote a few examples. The "Annals of Ulster" quote the solar eclipse of A.D. 664 as happening on the first of May. Bede says it took place on the third of May; he is wrong by two days, and the original authority of the "Annals of Ulster" is right, *i.e.*, he was, in all probability, a contemporary, and had some better inkling of astronomy, or more exact observations, than Bede's guarantees. The Irish annals cite the first fifteen abbots of Bangor, with the years of their deaths, to A.D. 691. The Antiphonary of Bangor, a curious and invaluable compilation of the eighth century preserved at Milan, recites the same list in identical order and chronology. This means that Irish annals which never left the kingdom agree with a Latin composition either written abroad or absent from Ireland over one thousand years. One sees that in this case, mediæval transcripts or continuations of the Irish annals, like the Antiphonary of Bangor, rest on contemporary authorities. Again, the battle of Clontarf took place in 1014, on Good Friday, April 23d. There are some fine battle-pieces in mediæval Latin and vernacular literature, but nothing to surpass the contemporary account in the book called "Wars of the Gaels with the Galls" (foreigners, Danes).[2] It is a superb picture, the work of one of the bards of Brian, and which no painter of military scenes can read unmoved. There is scarcely any epic element wanting—the ominous earnestness of the preparations; the wild mad rush of Irish and Danes; the silken dragons of the latter flapping in the wind; the battle movements of the Irish like reapers cutting down corn; the Danish ships out on the flood tide, helpless witnesses of the fatal scene; the Danes retreating slowly into the surf; the regular crushing of the horrid battle axes of the Irish through steel and bone; the bitter controversy between king Sitric and his Irish wife upon the parapets of Dublin; the brave death of Murrough the son of Brian; the epic

[1] The works of Flann and Gilla Caemhain are preserved in the *Book of Lecain* and the *Book of Ballymote* (O'Curry, pp. 54, 55) and in other ancient copies (O'Reilly, pp. 74–78).

[2] The *Wars of the Gaedhel with the Gaill*, or the invasion of Ireland by the Danes and other Norsemen. Edited, with translations, by James Heuthorn Todd. London, 1867.

scene of the valiant boy Thurlough, grandson of Brian, whose body was the next day fished out of the Tolka, his young fingers tightly wound in the black locks of a great Dane; and above all, the dramatic death of the aged Brian, while the battle raged on around him as though a vast multitude were hewing down Tomar's wood with axes, as though the forest were on fire, and only the tall trees standing. Men who could write like that, whose tale in our stiff, cold, composite tongue breathes still the wild fancy, the passionate hope, and the awful sense of relief of that great day, were no common thinkers. But the most noticeable thing about this narrative is its exactness. In the story it is said that the battle began at high-tide in the morning and ended at high-tide in the evening. When Dr. Todd was editing these Annals he requested a capable astronomer to calculate the tides for him on the twenty-third of April, 1014, and the high tides of that day were found to be exactly at the hours stated by the chronicler.

There are other Irish Annals of the late Middle Ages, such as the continuation of Tighernach to 1178, the Annals of Innisfallen, of Clonmacnoise, of Boyle, of Ulster, of Connacht, of Loch Cé, the "Chronicon Scotorum" (made in Galway about 1650) of the great antiquarian, Dudley MacFirbis, the last of the regularly educated and most accomplished masters of the history, antiquities, laws and language of ancient Erin; their history and description would interest us if we did not desire to make room for a brief account of the famous "Annals of the Four Masters."

The "Annals of the Four Masters" are a compilation in Gaelic of the national and ecclesiastical history of Ireland year by year, from the earliest recorded times to the year 1616. They were finished in 1636, after many years of collecting and four years of composition and transcription, by Franciscan friars at Kilbarron, in Tyrconnel Abbey, in Donegal. The chief of the four writers was Michael O'Clery, a descendant of one of the great mediæval teaching families of Ireland. With his brother, he spent many years collecting the best manuscripts for the civil and ecclesiastical history of his country, and wrote it down between 1632–1636, at the expense of Fergal O'Gara, an Irish chieftain of his acquaintance, and of the friary of Killabarron. No nation in the world has such an annalistic work, and though executed at a late date, it was done by men of antiquarian descent, who lived among abundant manuscripts, many of which have since been lost, who wrote on their native soil, among the people and the churches whose fate they chronicled, ere yet the monuments, inscriptions, old records and memories had been ruthlessly and needlessly destroyed, or the national consciousness and souvenirs dulled by two centuries of hopelessness and apathy. The work has its faults, like all annals,

but it remains an inexhaustible mine of personal, social, topographical and literary information. The declining sun of historical learning in Ireland emitted no weak or uncertain beams, and the Four Masters need not fear to be classed with the Benedictines of a later age or with the great searchers of our own day, for painstaking accuracy, completeness, and sympathetic good sense in the choice of their materials and their orderly distribution.[1] "Few, if any, historians ever rivaled them in generosity and magnanimity, such their heroic love of heroism, of manly or womanly virtue, no matter what its origin, or the cause in which it was exhibited. The Protestant and the Catholic, the Englishman and the Irishman, the Milesian chief and Norman-Irish noble, or English courtier, fresh from the Queen's smiles—all in strict proportion to their worth or unworth—are stigmatized or praised in these pure and ardent pages. Modern historians of this temper we need, and we hope yet will have, as magnanimous, as just, and as veracious as that famous mediæval Four."[2]

Yet I hear them in my musings,
And I see them as I gaze,
Four meek men around the cresset,
With the scrolls of other days;
Four unwearied scribes, who treasure
Every word and every line,
Saving every ancient sentence
As if writ by hand divine.

On their calm, down-bended foreheads,
Tell me what it is you read;
Is there malice or ambition
In the will or in the deed?
Oh, no! no! the angel Duty
Calmly lights the dusty walls,
And their four worn right hands follow
Where the angel's radiance falls.

Not of fame, and not of fortune,
Do these eager penmen dream;
Darkness shrouds the hills of Banba,
Sorrow sits by every stream;
One by one, the lights that lead her,
Hour by hour were quenched in gloom;
But the patient, sad Four Masters
Toil on in their lonely room—
Duty thus defying doom.—*D'Arcy McGee.*

II. *The Genealogies and Pedigrees.*—Perhaps the most finical

[1] *The Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters*, from the earliest period to the year 1616. Edited, with translation and notes, by John O'Donovan. 7 vols., 4to. Dublin, 1851.

[2] Stanlish O'Grady in *The Bog of Stars*, London, 1893, p. 154.

of all peoples in point of genealogy or general family descent and relationship, and pedigree or direct lineal descent, was the ancient Irish. The clan or tribal system made this imperative; for their chief wealth, the land and stock, together with the authority, went by certain fixed lines of descent, and the exact relationship to the deceased land-owner or chief was a matter of great importance, at least to all the males of the tribe. Hence it was necessary to have public records kept not only by the Over-King for his sub-kings and chiefs, but by the latter princes and rulers. This keeping of genealogies and pedigrees, with their regular comparison and correction, seems to have been one of the most indispensable duties of the ollave, or poet-historian, whom every great chief or family maintained, and to whom, for this and similar purposes, lands and stipends were regularly allowed. The Irish antiquarians quote, as examples of such genealogical collections, the lost "Saltair of Cormac," of the third century, the lost "Book of Dromsneacht," of the beginning of the fifth century, just before the arrival of St. Patrick, which books are often cited in the mediæval Irish manuscripts, and were in existence as late as the twelfth century. These genealogies are usually of the Milesian race, with very few exceptions, and begin, or rather end, with the famous Heber and Heremon, the two surviving sons of Milesius.

This is not the place to discuss the ancient genealogies and pedigrees. They have been much laughed at, and perhaps they deserve it where they attempt to tie on the Milesian race to Magog, second son of Japhet; but the Irish were not the only mediæval people who tried the same feat. When the pagan nations became Christian, they wanted to enter in some way into the history of the past; not to be entirely left out of the plan of God's dealings with man. Hence their desperate efforts to appear as descendants of Noah, Abraham, etc., a trait comparable to the desires of the Teutonic peoples to be descended from Priam, and the ancient British to come down from Brutus. This was good society in their eyes, and they went in by the window when they found the door shut. If they asserted their descent, who was going to dispute it? They had no documents for it, it was true, but were there any against it? Seriously, however, the ancient genealogies and pedigrees deserve attention when they move on local ground. The insular, backward position of the country; the necessity of public records and their actual existence; the oral traditions handed down by the long memories of a multitude of poets in difficult verse, whose complicated metre could not easily be broken; the existence of monuments, raths, lisses, cashels, weapons; great natural objects clothed with personality; names of rivers and hills; the evident ambition of the chiefs to hold

high rule in a land that knew only the tribal male descent; the need of holding large tracts of land for their peculiar system of agriculture—all this inclines any serious person to believe that they kept careful records, but does not oblige him to believe that there are no bad breaks in them, or that the Marquis of Thomond is a genuine O'Brien from the loins of an Irish king who died A.D. 234. *Sit cuique suum:* they cannot be dispensed with by antiquarians and historians, but the line of tradition must have been patched up more than once. Of these genealogies and pedigrees the old Irish annals are full, a fact which shows how many were kept and with what copiousness. The oldest and most reliable are no doubt those in the books of Leinster, Ballymote, and Lecain, while the fullest and most perfect is the great "Book of Genealogies," compiled 1650–1666, by the aged Dudley MacFirbis, already mentioned, out of the aforesaid books, and, where they ended, out of local records, private documents, and state papers of the period between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries. It would make 1300 quarto printed pages, and is perhaps the greatest single genealogical compilation known—done for love of God and country by an old archæologist, defenceless and outlawed, who never made a penny by this most arduous work, which is yet unpublished.[1]

The work of MacFirbis contains some odd criteria by which to distinguish the descendants of Milesius, the de Dannans, and the Firbolgs:

"Every one who is white of skin, brown of hair, bold, honorable, daring, prosperous, bountiful in the bestowal of property, wealth, and rings, and who is not afraid of battle or combat—they are the descendants of the sons of Milesius in Erin.

"Every one who is fair-haired, large; and every plunderer,

[1] "The autograph of this great compilation is now in possession of the Earl of Roden, and a fac-simile copy of it was made by me for the Royal Irish Academy in the year 1836. The title runs as follows: The Branches of Relationship and the Genealogical Ramifications of every colony that took possession of Erin from this time up to Adam (excepting only those of the Fomarians, Lochlanns and Saxon Galls, of whom we, however, treat, as they have settled in our country); together with a Sanctilogium and a Catalogue of the Monarchs of Erinn; and, finally, an Index, which comprises, in alphabetical order, the surnames and the remarkable places mentioned in the book, which was compiled by Dubbaltach Mac Firbhisigh of Lecain, 1650. Although the above is the customary way of giving titles to books at the present time, we will not depart from the following of our ancestors, the ancient summary custom, because it is the plainest, thus: "The place, time, author and cause of writing this book are—the place, the College of St. Nicholas, in Galway; the time, the time of the religious war between the Catholics of Ireland and the heretics of Ireland, Scotland and England, particularly the year 1650; the person or author, Dubballach, the son of Gilla Isa Môr Mac Ferbhisigh, historian, etc., of Lecain MacFerbis, *i.e.*, Fereragh, on the Moy; and the cause of writing the book is, to increase the glory of God and for the information of the people in general."—O'Curry, *Lectures, etc.*, p. 121.

every musical person, the professors of musical and entertaining performances, who are adepts in all druidical and magical arts—they are the descendants of the Tuatha de Dannans in Erin.

"Every one who is black-haired; who is a tattler, guileful, tale-telling, noisy, contemptible; every wretched, mean, strolling, unsteady, harsh, and inhospitable person; every slave, every mean thief, every churl, every one who loves not to listen to music and entertainment, the disturbers of every council and assembly, and the promoters of discord among the people—these are the descendants of the Firbolgs," etc.

The following very ancient character-sketch of mediæval nations is from an old poem copied by MacFirbis into his work:

"For building the noble Jews are famed,
And for truly fierce envy;
For size the guileless Armenians;
And for firmness the Saracens;
For acuteness and valor the Greeks;
For excessive pride the Romans;
For dullness the creeping Saxons;
For haughtiness the Spaniards;
For covetousness and revenge the French;
And for anger the Britons.
Such is the true knowledge of the trees (books),
For gluttony the Danes and for commerce;
For high spirit the Picts are not unknown;
And for beauty and amorousness the Gaedhels."

III. *The Historic Tales.*—The historical books which we have hitherto been considering are lengthy general accounts of matters concerning the whole nation, or at least the chief provinces, tribes and families. But the ancient Irish literature is prolific in particular histories, accounts of special events, battles, personal adventure and the like. No nation in Europe possesses such a varied series of personal adventures in the same period. What the Italian literature of the early Renaissance was to Europe in this respect, such was the splendid collection of Irish historic tales to mediæval Europe. We must note here that the introduction of fairies and the highly-colored poetical machinery which appear in these ancient tales no more affect their general historic value than the multitudinous miracles and monstrous stories of the mediæval chronicles deprive the latter of their proper credit. In both cases the writer or compiler yielded to current beliefs and prejudices. In both cases future generations of scribes or copyists embellished what was originally a plain unvarnished tale. The historic tales of Ireland may be divided into two classes, the more or less strictly historical and those tales in which there is a solid kernel of history, but which has been so overlaid with legend, so cobwebbed with the pretty

fancies of an imaginative, ardent, poetic race, that *now* the real history is the picture they give us of the customs, manners, habits, dress, tendencies, old sites and monuments, yearnings and ideals of a generous but solitary people, dwelling in quasi-nomadic simplicity on the loveliest of islands, amid all the beauties of nature, and for whom the forest and the stream, the lofty mountain and the vast surrounding seas were eloquent with a thousand tongues whose mystic speech our gross, complicated, material world is unable to decipher. Just so you meet in the heart of some rich tropical forest a splendid tree overgrown with pretty mosses, and robed in daintiest streamers and filaments that hide at once and devour the rugged and unsuspecting heart of oak which shelters and protects them. These stories were told and retold by the strolling bard and the aristocratic harper. They charmed the leisures of the tribesmen as they wandered with their flocks over the vast commons, and they wiled away the night-watches of the long-haired kerns and gallow-glasses as they reposed in their saffron tunics on their heavy battle-axes around the camp-fires. They were the charming primers, the catechisms of Irish history, such as the demotic mind constructed them, the secret channels through which the mediæval Irish imbibed fresh devotion to the soil of their birth. They were the impregnable spiritual castles and fastnesses out of which the ærial Keltic soul could never be driven. And they must be treated with reverence, for they contain much of what is sweetest and most durable in the Keltic nature—its irrepressible holy ardor for higher and more distant things; that Excelsior note of a race ever dissatisfied with stagnant actuality; its unconquerable thirst for wandering and adventure; its mystic insight into spiritual things; its quick, accurate sympathy with Nature in her thousand moods of gloom and gladness; its enchanting waywardness—a creature of tears and smiles all made up, alternately laughing like a fresh spring day, and again bursting out into all the ungovernable fury of an autumn storm.

Of the first class of these old historic tales I will only cite the Origin of the Borromean Tribute, in the Book of Leinster, the Wars of the Gaels with the Galls, the Wars of Thomond, and the Wars of Munster. These are local histories, as valuable as, if not more so than, the continental histories of abbeys, cathedrals, cities, and the like; contemporary, picturesque, filled with valuable genealogies and pedigrees which were to the tribal Kelt what the imperial charters and the papal letters were to the Teuton and Romance peoples, the public titles to property and office

The second class of Irish tales is much more numerous. The Book of Leinster enumerates one hundred and eighty-seven,

divided into classes, the "prime stories" as it calls them: Destructions, Battles, Cow-Spoils, Courtships, Navigations, Tragedies, Deaths, Expeditions Abroad, Elopements, Conflagrations, Irruptions of Lakes, Visions, Love Tales, Navigations, Colonizations, etc. These are only some fragments of the old historico-romantic literature of the Kelt, for every ollave or chief bard had to know seven times fifty such stories, and to recite them at command. The number of these tales recognized and in existence is considerable. They would fill over 4000 quarto printed pages. In them Ancient Ireland lives again. Take the Battle of Moytura (Cong in Mayo) between the Tuatha de Dannans and the Firbolgs. Legendary as it is, and irreducible in the retort of our criticism, what charm, what eternal truth in the chivalrous challenges, the passion of battle, the personal vanity, the quick dissatisfaction, the eternal cycle of revolution! The chiefs turn on the Regent King Breas, because, as the old chronicler says, "*the knives of his people were not greased at his table, nor did their breath smell of ale at the banquet.* Neither their poets, nor their bards, nor their satirists, nor their pipers, nor their trumpeters, nor their jugglers, nor their buffoons, were ever seen engaged in amusing them at the assemblies of his court." That is surely a true picture of the jealous illegitimate regent, and the fickle, gifted, light hearted people, who spent their days in war and the chase, and their nights in revelry and song. So too, the enumeration of the helpers whom King Nuada of the Silver Hand called to his aid,—the smiths, the silver and brass workers, the carpenters, surgeons, sorcerers, druids, poets, witches, etc., and the services they are ready to render. There lives again, in these semi-historic tales, a people of barbaric simplicity and grandeur.

> "Immortal beings visibly commingling as of old
> In mortal struggles. Here at length I find my youthful dream
> Made real. Here the mighty deeds of antique heroes
> No longer all inimitable. Here Hercul's self might own
> Fit labour for another Toil, nor ask the task alone.
> Wherefore with awful joy elate I stand, and bid thee hail
> Last hero-stage of all the world, illustrious Innisfail!
> Land of the lingering Gods! green land! still sparkling fresh and fair
> With morning-dew of heroism, dried up and gone elsewhere."
>
> *Ferguson's Congal, Bk. V.*

These are the Homeric days of the Gael, and these recitals have just that historic truth which is inherent in every epic, above all in its original materials, for the Keltic literature never got as far as the full-blown epic, in which systematic, though perhaps unconscious, falsification is carried on. The Kelts have furnished the literature of the world rather with a multitude of epic-esque

stories and tales, the rich quarryings of a poetic, mystic, deep-sentient nature, intensely alive to every harmony of sound and color; animal indeed, but not grossly so; with an eye upturned to the region of the spiritual, and a soul tugging tightly to get free from the tyranny of the present and the routine, to soar away into the dim blissful world with whose sweet odors it was drenched, even within the prison of the body. It would be too long to describe here, even in faintest outline, the rich fund of manners, beliefs, social and domestic customs, which lies embedded in the semi-historic tales of Slaughters, Sieges, Famous Deaths, Loves, Courtships and Elopements, Personal Adventures by land and sea, in caves and in desert islands, Migrations, Colonizations, Inundations, Visions and the like, which make up the bulk of the historico-romantic Keltic literature. The whole world was before the mediæval Keltic bard whence to choose, and right royally did he lay it under tribute. The "Arabian Nights" are wearisome gabble compared with the inventiveness, the playful wit, the rich descriptions, the fine, droll, arch humor that bring these princes of story-tellers before us each with his little hand-harp or *crotta*, his tall head-gear, his short yellow or green tunic, braided with purple or gold embroidered, his scarlet cloak flung back from the broad white throat, and held by a golden fibula or brooch, while the fair curling locks, the blue restless eye, and the high forehead denoted the pride of the harper's blood and the dreamy ardor of his soul. No common men were they, for the literary order was always peer to the highest in ancient Erin, and the hand that protected the tribal borders was frequently that which struck the harp with the lightest and fairiest touch, wrote the loveliest page, and threaded with nerviest stroke and surest eye the tangled, mystic mazes of some splendid initial.

T. J. Shahan.
Catholic University.

THE LATEST PHASES OF PANTHEISTIC EVOLUTION.

KNOWING to what extent the views of men are apt to disagree, we cannot expect that the general idea of evolution will be developed by any two leading minds along the same line of thought. We can anticipate it the less, the more intricate the idea is in itself, and the more difficult a problem cosmic unity presents which it has been adopted to explain. In fact, as the chaos, bearing adverse elements in its womb, has brought forth a world of strife, so has evolution in its further development branched off into numberless theories no less in conflict with one another than the hostile powers of nature.

The first cause of disagreement among evolutionary philosophers arose from their antagonistic views on teleology. Whilst some of them recognize design in the unity and order of the universe, and think it necessary to trace them back to an intelligent cause, others persistently deny purpose in nature, and refuse to go beyond material forces in accounting for the beauty and harmony of the world. Thus, evolutionists are divided into two opposite schools; the one, materialistic, because it derives all being from matter, the other pantheistic, because it regards the divine spirit as the immanent ground of all existence. A third school has risen to mediate between the two preceding. Admitting the fundamental tenets of both, conceding purpose in nature, but denying the spirituality of the first cause, it undertakes to eliminate the opposition between them by endowing matter with cognitional power. Nor are the defenders of pantheistic evolution of one mind in explaining the process by which the divine spirit develops itself through continuous differentiation into the visible world. Some conceive it as constantly progressing from indeterminateness to determinateness in its manifestations, though infinnitely perfect in itself; others hold that, indeterminate in its nature, it evolves successively into every form of existence by a never-ceasing process of thought. Thus, we meet with a two-fold pantheism; the one, realistic, admitting a real ground of existence, the other, idealistic, taking thought for the ultimate self-evolving principle.

In the present essay we shall give an exposition only of realistic pantheism. Let it not be said, that this is an antiquated theory. Old though it may be, it is not out of date even in our days of enlightenment. We meet with it at the threshold of the

history of civilization. According to the Vedantic philosophy of the Hindus, Brahma is the infinite, the universe his manifold transformations produced by his own activity. He alone has being, and, as the one without another, is the unity of all that is. The multitudinous objects of this world, as distinct from him and from one another, have no existence, but are merely appearances. The human soul alone forms an exception, because it is not a transformation but a part of Brahma, a spark shot forth from his spirit. The Eleatic school of ancient Greece epitomized its doctrine in the saying, that All is One and One is All. It considered being as absolutely one, eternal, simple, unchangeable, intelligent, and regarded the world, consisting of the multitude of changeable things, as unreal and merely apparent.

A new and ingenious system of pantheistic monism was devised by the Neoplatonists of Alexandria. According to Plotinus, the most prominent philosopher of that school, the primal One, or the primal Good, is absolute unity, simplicity, and infinity, yet is, in itself, devoid of definite form. From its transcendent perfection emanates the image of the One, a second divinity diffused around the first like an ocean of light. In itself the image is essential being, but it turns to the One from which it draws its origin, and in this act attains knowledge, that is, it becomes the Mind (νοῦς). Becoming self-conscious, it brings about the first of all differentiations, the ideal distinction between the subject knowing and the object known. From the mind emanates the world-soul, the supreme and universal soul, which contains all individual souls, undivided and undistinguished. The world-soul is the image of the mind, as the mind is the image of the One. And as the mind, produced by the One gives issue to the world-soul, so again, the world-soul brings forth the individual souls. These, constantly emanating from the universal source, constitute the life, beauty, and order of the universe. Matter is the last effluence. It is the precipitate, the dregs of the whole process of emanation; it is the ultimate enervation, the extinction of the ideal, the shadow, as it were, which the light of higher emanations flings back to its uttermost boundary. In a word, it is no longer a reality, but only in appearance.

The Ionic philosophers, the first among the Greeks who devoted themselves to deeper inquiry into nature, did not deny the reality and existence of matter, but, on the contrary, recognized it alone as being. To account for the origin of material things, as well as for the order and beauty resplendent in them, they thought it necessary to hold that the universe was animated by one universal soul, one divine, all-pervading power. In a much later period, the Stoics entertained the same view. They, too, admitted a divine

principle immanent in the world, giving it life and energy. God was conceived by them as the world-soul, as the great universal Reason, dwelling in the universe as in His body, shaping and developing it as His organism, acting through its realms and provinces as with His limbs and members. Still, neither the early Ionics nor the Stoics distinguished God from matter. They identified Him with the primary constituents of material beings, with water, or ether, or fire, which they supposed to be endowed with reason. By condensation of the finer or divine elements, bodies were formed, fallen, indeed, below the divinity, but still permeated by divine power; by rarefaction of their gross material they return to God and are again resolved into His substance.

Thus, every shade and species of pantheism was embraced in the highest antiquity: theological pantheism, which knows only divine being, and regards the universe as an affection, a transformation, or a manifestation of God; cosmological pantheism, which raises the material world to identity with the divine substance; emanative pantheism, which takes finite being, and foremost the human soul, for an effluence from the Deity. Nor did this doctrine, identifying the infinite and the finite, God and the world, entirely disappear in succeeding ages. It always found some support, even after Christianity had enlightened mankind. It was resuscitated by Giordano Bruno and Baruch Spinoza at the very dawning of modern philosophy, and has ever since won new favor. In our own days, it seems to have reached its highest ascendency. Could it happen otherwise? When the personal Deity is disavowed as an obstacle to cosmic unity, when all phenomena and forms of existence are attributed to one universal self-evolving principle, when advanced culture, abhorring the exclusive reign of mechanical laws, demands intelligence as the cause of the order and beauty adorning this universe, and as the source of reason manifested by man, then, indeed, it becomes a logical necessity to hold that God, the infinite spirit, is all in all, not by creation, but by identity—the ground, the substance, the life, and energy of everything that exists.

Pantheism was taught in Germany during the first half of this century in the lecture-halls of most universities and was widely spread among the educated class by learned publications. Though at present strongly counteracted by materialistic tendencies, it still finds many prominent advocates. H. Lotze's metaphysical views, plainly pantheistic in their final result, are nowadays spoken of in the highest terms of praise. He assumes that no other than animated or spiritual existence is possible and maintains that the entire world is a harmonious system of spiritual monads acting on one another; he holds that mutual influence is possible only

among agents united in their being and thus regards the oneness of all monads on a real ground as the necessary condition for harmonious interaction. Such a ground, in his opinion, is God's infinite substance. In it all things are substantially one. Proceeding from it, they are all co-essential with it, and each of them exists only because it has its place in the import of an idea expressing some phase of God, the idea being the very essence of the thing.

The pantheistic tendency of I. Fechner is still more striking. After having attempted to prove that being is nothing but appearance in consciousness, he divides all appearances into two classes, the inward and the outward. To the former belong all the phenomena which are apprehended by self, to the latter those which are apprehended by others. The totality of the first class he calls soul, that of the second he designates body. Hence he infers that there is no real distinction between soul and body. They are but two modes of appearance of the same real subject and have the same being in common, which is nothing else than their mutual dependence. As the distinction between soul and body is thus denied, it is easily understood that conscious life must be universal. All things are alive, not only man and brute and plants, but also inorganic bodies. The earth is living; for it is one perfect, self-evolving whole. Nay, the entire universe is one great living being. Its soul is God. He is, however, not distinct from the universe, as, according to Fechner's principles, no soul is distinct from the body. He is God and the world at once; God, inasmuch as He appears inwardly, the world inasmuch as He appears outwardly. To Himself He is only God, because His entirety appears to Himself; to the finite things, to which he appears only outwardly, He is the world. Thus identified with the world, He is not distinct from finite beings; as objects of His own consciousness, they are within Him. Nor is He distinct from the changeable; on the contrary, particular appearances are always changing, always ebbing and flowing in His consciousness. Nevertheless He is infinite, because He is the totality of all that is; He is unchangeable, because He is the oneness of all appearances and the permanent law of all changes. Consequently, as life is common to all things, the universe is a system of units of consciousness, all co-ordinate to one another and subordinate to one supreme or divine consciousness, which is the bond of unity not only by comprising and containing them, but also by apprehending their oneness.

H. Lotze and I. Fechner have been singled out from the German philosophers, because their intellectual influence can be traced in the English-speaking world. Here pantheism was welcomed as a fit reaction against the destructive tendency of materialism. The

mechanical view, prevalent since the last century in the interpretation of the universe, had been embodied in the new theory of evolution. The devisers of the latter, of whom nearly all deny teleology, disdain to acknowledge any other than material laws. They base everything on matter—the formation of bodies, their reduction to a well-concerted system, the rise and growth of life, the development of intellect and will, the existence and the welfare of human society. Noble and far-sighted minds recoiled from the inconsistencies, or at least, from the consequences attending a theory of this kind. So it came to pass that a supreme intelligent being, immanent in the world, pervading it with vital force, perfecting and developing it as moments of the divine life or as parts of the divine substance, was hailed by many as the saviour of beauty, order, and civilization, as the mediator between elevated morality and advanced science. The forms of pantheism to which preference was given were chiefly two. Either God was conceived as the world-soul, or the world was regarded as an emanation from the infinite substance.

First we meet with thinkers who reduce all forces that are active in the universe to one, and identify this one with the power of the divine will. A. R. Wallace, finding it impossible fully to interpret the universe, and human nature especially, by the laws of inert matter, resorts to the following speculation :

"If we have traced one force, however minute, to an origin in our own *will* while we have no knowledge of any other primary force, it does not seem an improbable conclusion that all force may be will-force, and thus the whole universe is not only dependent on, but actually is the will of higher intelligences, or of a supreme intelligence."[1]

After a few sentences he adds :

" The view we have now arrived at seems to me more grand and sublime, as well as far simpler, than any other. It exhibits the universe as a universe of intelligence and will-power, and by enabling us to rid ourselves of the impossibility of thinking of the mind but as connected with matter, it opens up infinite possibilities of existence, connected with infinitely varied manifestations of force, totally distinct forms, yet as real as what we term matter."[2]

---

[1] *Contributions to Natural Selection*, p. 368.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 369. It is astonishing that a thinker like the Duke of Argyll leans to the same view. " It may be," he says, " that all natural forces are resolvable into some one force; and indeed in the modern doctrine of the Correlation of Forces, an idea which is a near approach to this, has already entered the domain of science. It may also be that this one force, into which all others return again, is itself but a mode of action of the divine will. But we have no instruments whereby to reach this last analysis.—*The Reign of Law*, p. 127. See also p. 275.

A. Winchell, in his refutation of Darwinism, advances the same idea, yet with far greater assurance. He affirms:

"We are driven by the necessary laws of thought to pronounce those energies styled gravitation, heat, chemical affinity and their correlates, nothing less than the energies of intelligent will. But as it is not the human will that energizes in the whirlwind and the comet, it must be the divine will. It is God's present power and volition which draws the apple to the ground and balances the planet in its orbit. Science has long tended to the synthesis of the forces which it recognizes in matter, and all have been pronounced but forms of a single force. It only remained for her to discover the nature of that one protean, panegyric energy, and the suggestion has come from the ranks of science itself that this is simply the divine intelligent will."[1]

A full theory of the divine world-soul has been set forth by R. W. Emerson. True, this renowned author is more poet than philosopher. But few have been more influential than he in shaping American thought. It is also true that his writings were published years before the evolutionary views of Darwin gained prominence. Still he broaches a system of evolution based on pantheistical principles. His leading tenets may be reduced to the following seven propositions:

The ultimate truth in which all human knowledge is summed up, is that all being must be resolved into God.

"This is the ultimate fact . . . . the resolution of all into the ever-blessed One."[2]

There is one mind in all men called the universal and supreme mind, or the over-soul.

"There is one mind common to all individual men."

"Who has access to this universal mind is a party to all that is or can be done, for this is the only sovereign agent. Of the work of this mind, history is the record."[3]

"The weakness of the intellect begins when it would be something of itself. The weakness of the will begins when the individual would be something of himself. All reform aims in some one particular to let the great soul have its way through us; in other words, to engage us to obey."[4]

This one supreme and universal mind is God Himself. Hence man is an organ, an incarnation of the divine spirit, a divinity in disguise, God in nature.

"From within or from behind a light shines through us upon

---

[1] *The Doctrine of Evolution* (New York, 1874), p. 109.
[2] *Essays* (New York, 1884), p. 65.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 241.

things and makes us aware that we are nothing, but the light is all. A man is the façade of a temple wherein all wisdom and all good abide. What we commonly call man, the eating, drinking, counting man, does not, as we know him, represent himself, but misrepresents himself. Him we do not respect, but the soul whose organ he is, would he let it appear through his action, would make our knees bend."[1]

"One mode of the divine teaching is the incarnation of the divine spirit in a form—in forms like my own."[2]

"Every man is a divinity in disguise."[3]

"I am God in nature."[4]

Even the material universe is alive and is animated by the same soul as man.

"Thus the universe is alive. All things are moral. The soul which within us is a sentiment, outside of us is a law. We feel its inspirations; out there in history we can see its fatal strength. It is almighty. All nature feels its grasp. It is in the world and the world is by it."[5]

"Let it suffice that in the light of these two facts that the mind is one, and that nature is its correlative, history is to be read and written."[6]

It is consequently also the divine spirit that pervades and quickens nature.

"Beautifully shines a spirit through the bruteness and toughness of matter. Alone omnipotent, it converts all things to its own end. The adamant streams into softest, but precise form before it, but whilst I look at it, its outline and texture are changed altogether."[7]

Nature, therefore, the rational beings included, is the shadow, the appearance, the word, the generation of God, His enacting Himself in space and time, the rapid efflux of His goodness executing and organizing itself.

"We learn that God is; that He is in me; and that all things are shadows of Him."[8]

"The true doctrine of omnipresence is that God reappears with all His parts in every moss and cobweb."[9]

"The manifold tenacious qualities, this chemistry and vegetation, these metals and animals, which seem to stand there for their own sake, are means and methods only, are words of God, and as fugitive as other words."[10]

"Omnipresence is a higher fact. . . . . These things proceed

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 240. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 247. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 272. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 93. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 16. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 274. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 92. [10] *Ibid.*, p. 278.

from the eternal generation of the soul. Cause and effect are two sides of one fact."[1]

"It (*the universal soul*) is eternal, but it enacts itself in time and space."[2]

"The idealism of Berkeley is only a crude statement of the idealism of Jesus, and that again is a crude statement of the fact that all nature is the rapid efflux of goodness executing and organizing itself."[3]

There is, however, in nature not the fulness of the divine being, but a steady progression to ever greater perfection, the higher forms of existence growing out of the lower; in other words, an orderly evolution which is God's eternal generation of life ever more perfect.

"In man we still trace rudiments or hints of all we esteem badges of servitude in lower races; yet in him they enhance his nobleness and grace; as Io, in Æschylus, transformed to a cow, offends the imagination, but how changed when, as Isis in Egypt, she meets Jove, a beautiful woman with nothing of the metamorphosis left but the lunar horns as a splendid ornament of her brows!"[4]

"The natural world may be conceived of as a system of concentric circles, and we now and then detect in nature slight dislocations, which apprise us that this surface on which we stand is not fixed, but sliding."[5]

"The same law of eternal procession ranges all that we call virtues, and extinguishes each in the light of a better."[6]

"This incessant movement and progression of which all things partake could never become sensible to us but by a contrast to some principle of fixture or stability in the soul. Whilst the eternal generation of circles proceeds, the eternal generator abides. The central life is somewhat superior to creation, superior to knowledge and thought, and contains all its circles. Forever it labors to create a life and thought as large and excellent as itself, but in vain; for that which is made instructs how to make a better."

There is nothing wanting in R. W. Emerson's speculation to make it both pantheistic and evolutionary. It is truly pantheistic. For, according to it, God is all in all; He is the soul that animates all nature, the mind that thinks in all men, the power that works all phenomena; and conversely the universe is merely the form under which He appears, the organism in which He actualizes His goodness. It is also evolutionary. For God is not perfect from the beginning or from eternity, but developing this visible universe

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 279. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 93. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 274.
[4] *Ibid*, p. 16. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 278. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 279. [7] *Ibid.*, p. 282.

from Himself grows in life, beauty, and greatness by consecutive degrees.

All the charms which poetry could lend have been lavishly poured on this pantheistic-evolutionary theory to make it pleasing and to captivate the minds of men.

It would seem as if R. W. Emerson's tenets were re-echoed, in part at least, by an American writer of our own days. Mr. J. T. Bixby, who so ably refuted Herbert Spencer's moral doctrine by setting forth its destructive tendencies, endeavors to reconstruct an elevated morality by the assumption that God animates the entire universe as his own organism and evolves it from lower to ever higher degrees of being, until he attains to consciousness in man. Two quotations from "The Crisis in Morals" will suffice to substantiate our assertion:

"The infinite world-organism is the body and manifestation of God; the laws of that whole are the eternal laws of God. And when we recognize the solidarity of our vital being with this divine life and embodiment, we begin to see into the heart of the mystery, the unquestionable authority and supreme sanction of duty. Our moral intuitions are simply the unchanging laws of the universe that have emerged to consciousness in the human heart. Under the reiterated impressions of the world-life in which we are environed, and with the clarified vision of truth that is given where the impartial mind begins to look out on the world, the inherent principles of the universal reason reflect themselves in the mirror of the moral nature."[1]

"We may look upon the moral laws as the vital reactions of the plastic organization of humanity to the constantly repeated impressions of the righteous cosmic life in which man is environed, emerging at length in human consciousness in the forms of intuitions of duty and the rightful supremacy of the higher motives over the lower; and the enlightened conscience we may regard as the expression in the human soul of the divine consciousness. . . . . Morality is the victory of the divine life in us—the inward sovereign spirit of the universe that has ever moved onward from chaos to cosmos, from lifelessness to life, from the outward to the inward. The objective foundation of ethics is in that unity of all which secures the unchanging orderliness of events and which binds all the parts of the universe and the members of its great household into one interdependent whole."[2]

A. R. Wallace and A. Winchell, as well as R. W. Emerson and J. T. Bixby, regard God as the soul, the mind, the reason of the universe; but not one of them searches into the manner in which

[1] *The Crisis in Morals*, pp. 285, 286.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 310, 311.

he works in it and brings forth its divine forms, developing one from the other in perfect order. This is a deeper and more difficult question, the solution of which, however, has not been left unattempted by other pantheistic philosophers and, least of all, by those who came under the influence of German thought. Of these we must first mention Dr. James Martineau.

He conceives of God as the universal will-power immanent in the world. For, in his opinion, all power must be resolved into one, and all power is will-power.[1] Accordingly, there exists one universal will to which all operations and all effects must be attributed. This being no other than the divine will, God must be considered as embodied in the universe, and *vice versa* the universe must be regarded as a system animated with divine consciousness as its moulding life.[2]

After the divine, all-pervading power has been defined as rational will, its activity in the world must be interpreted conformably to our experience of intellectual volition. The course of the will is ever from the indeterminate to the determinate, the passage being made by rational preference among possibilities. The process involves thought and action, yet both of quite different attributes. Thought has its intensity at the outset, action in the sequel. For the mind exercises its highest functions in origination, in disposing of new conditions, in setting order by differentiation; the will exerts its power chiefly by carrying into being the schemes intellectually conceived. Action, having grown intense, works itself into automatic, into an ordered mechanism, and, when this has been formed, a lower consciousness, should any be required, is sufficient for its continuance. But when action has become habitual and is executed automatically, thought, whose life is beyond the conquered and legislated realm, is liberated, as it were, from its reclaimed and settled province, and breaks into new regions and ascends to higher problems.[3] Such, therefore, must the process be according to which the divine will gradually works in the universe, and of such it is understood to be, the nature and origin of matter are accounted for, and the pursuit of ever higher ends is reconciled with rigid mechanism.

"Does anybody forbid us to conceive similarity of the kosmical development—that it started from the freedom of indefinite possibilities and the ubiquity of universal consciousness, that as intellectual exclusions narrowed the field, and traced the definite lines of admitted movement, the tension of purpose, less needed

[1] *Modern Materialism in Its Relation to Religion and Theology* (New York, 1877), pp. 163, 170, 176.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 176, 189.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 176.

on those, left them as habits of the universe, and operated rather for higher and ever higher ends not yet provided for; that the more mechanical, therefore, a natural law may be, the further it is from its source, and that the inorganic and unconscious portion of the world, instead of being the potentiality of the organic and conscious, is rather its residual precipitate, formed as the indwelling Mind of all concentrates an intenser aim on the upper margin of the ordered whole, and especially on the inner life of natures that can resemble him? I am aware that this speculation inverts the order of the received cosmogonies. But in advancing it I only follow in the track of a veteran physiologist and philosopher, whose command of all the materials of judgment is beyond question—the author of "Psychophysik." Fechner insists that protoplasm and zoophyte structure, instead of being the inchoate matter of organization, is the cast-off residuum of all previous differentiation, stopping short of the separation of animal from plant, and of sex from sex, and no more capable of further development than is inorganic matter, without power beyond its own, of producing organization."[1]

Still further explanations have been advanced in a recently published volume by J. G. Schurman, Professor of Philosophy in Cornell University.[2] He defends a complete system of pantheism, which embodies the views of many English and German philosophers, those especially of Dr. Martineau and H. Lotze. The following may be considered as an outline of it.

As creation is absurd and intrinsically impossible,[3] God must be regarded as the immanent ground of the universe, the intramundane cause of the uncreated world, its very self and substance, the vivifying and all-ordering principle of the cosmos, the universal life and all-animating power.[4] Yet, though thus immanent in the world and identical with it, he is not in any way material; he is absolute spiritual life, he is a spirit, the infinite spirit, the father of spirits.[5]

The world, on the other hand, is the eternal manifestation of God, His spoken word, the expression of His ever-active, inexhaustible will, a phase, a function of the divine life, the externalization of spirit, a tissue which the spirit is ever weaving.[6]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 177–179.

[2] *Belief in God, Its Origin, Nature and Basis*, being the Winkley Lectures of the Andover Theological Seminary for the year 1890.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 139, 142, 149, 152.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 152, 156, 160, 161, 169.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 217–223. Spirit is defined by Prof. Schurman as a subject which is conscious of its states, and opposes itself to them as the permanent unity that has them.—Page 168.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 161, 173, 174, 218.

The causes which we perceive as active in the universe, are centres of energy through which one supernatural will pours forth his all-animating life and power.[1] They are not and cannot be distinct either from God or from one another, because such a distinction would render causality impossible. Nor have they distinct activities of their own; their action is that of God.

"Manifestly the desideratum of thought is that causality shall be construed as the immanent operation of one single and real being as infinite as the universe whose processes we apprehend through the notion of causal efficiency. The unity of being is involved in the notion of reciprocal action between individuals."[2]

To designate in a word the relationship in which the world stands to God, "the reality of finite beings is but a mode of divine activity,"[3] or they are but states of the one absolute being, for which, through which, and by means of which, and above all for the sake of which, they exist, act, and cease to exist.[4]

Nevertheless there is a distinction between the finite spirit and matter, between spiritual and material beings. The latter are "*mere* states of the absolute reality," the former are "also self-conscious subjects which in a measure lift themselves above and outside the universal basis of existence."[5] The finite spirit, so far as its essential ground is concerned is identical with the infinite spirit in whose life it is included and of whose divine activity it is a mode, but it is moreover a part of the divine essence, a part which, having existence for itself and being self-conscious, has an activity of its own, though dependent on God. Material things on the contrary, are only modes of the divine activity, only an efflux of the divine energy, and have, apart from God, no energy whatever.[6]

"Material things exist simply as modes of the divine activity; they have no existence for themselves. Spiritual things, on the other hand, exist at once in God and for themselves. They are in God; for as God is the underlying ground of all things, so philosophy must confess with Scripture that in him we too live and move and have our being. But the characteristic of spiritual beings is, that, like their divine source, they are also for themselves. That is to say, they know themselves as one amid a multiplicity of states which they recognize as their own, and they know themselves as freely initiating action on a scene where all other actions are the determined issues of antecedent conditions."[7]

The universe being uncreated, is eternal and infinite. It is the revelation of God's whole being and must be considered as "the

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 173. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 165. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 208. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 167, 168.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 168. [6] *Ibid.*, pp. 225–229. [7] *Ibid.*, pp. 225, 226.

organic expression, and the only real expression of the life of an eternal and infinite spirit."

"What God did He was always doing; and the universe is the eternal manifestation of his activity. If you call it a creation, it is a continuous creation." . . . . "Furthermore, that the external manifestation is as boundless as the life it expresses, science makes exceedingly probable. In any event, we have not the slightest reason to contrast the finitude of the world with the infinitude of God." . . . . "As the universe at every moment of its existence, expresses at least a phase of the divine life, its so-called imperfection resolves itself into a momentary aspect, a part of a perfect whole. At no moment does it reveal the absolute fulness of the divine life; but at no moment is it anything else than a function of that divine life." . . . . "I cannot even agree with those who think that the theist is concerned to maintain the actuality of a divine life or agency beyond the natural order of things and prior to it. For if the natural order is eternal and infinite, as there seems no reason to doubt, it will be difficult to find a meaning for 'beyond' and 'prior.' Of this illimitable, ever-existing universe God is the inner ground and substance."[1]

"It is equally conceivable that God has revealed His whole being, though man has yet read but part of the revelation. And in any case, we may be sure that the revelation, whether total or partial, is a true expression of the divine nature. Hence we cannot follow Dr. Martineau in treating the cosmos which has come into being as but a sample of an unknown number that might have been."

"The divine will can express itself only as it does, because no other expression would reveal what it is. Of such a will the eternal universe is the eternal realization." "The world is not one of the countless possible machines, as the mathematico-mechanical genius of the eighteenth century conceived it, but the organic expression, and the only real expression, of the life of an eternal and infinite spirit. To imagine its place taken by another world is to imagine God other than He is. The possibility of a multitude of worlds is like the possibility of a multitude of gods."[2]

Being infinite, the universe includes various grades of being. "It is false if it means that all spiritual and material beings, because all included in the one absolute life, are all on the same plane of reality or unreality. The one kind has risen to a consciousness of self and of freedom; the other has not. And whether they be in or out of the divine being, the difference between self and selfless stuff is the greatest we know or can imagine. Nor is there any reason why God should not manifest himself in and through degrees of reality, varying from zero to infinity."[3]

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 172–174. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 175–178. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 227.

"We are forced to see in nature a spiritual ground which, with an absolute self-consciousness of its own, may yet be said to sleep in the stone, dream in the animal, and again wake to life in man."[1]

Nor is evolution, the succession of changes, to be denied; rather it is to be affirmed as the self-deposited order of the divine ideas.

"To the modern scientist as to the Greek cosmologist, the universe is eternal, but subject eternally to evolutions and dissolutions."[2]

"When we say that anything develops, we mean that it undergoes changes which occur in a determinate manner and lead towards a definite end. . . . . As causation proved to be immanent changes, self-determined and compensating, in the life of the absolute spirit, so in a last analysis evolution signifies besides such causation the self-deposited order of divine ideas in accordance with which these changes actually occur."[3]

Hence the evolutionary theories of Darwin and others are not so much false as incomplete; they need only a deeper ground to rest upon.[4]

Of all the philosophical systems thus far spoken of that of Prof. Schurman undoubtedly is the most comprehensive. It clearly sets forth the pantheistic conception of God and of the universe, it marks out their relative position, as well as that of spirit and matter, it traces order back to its ultimate cause, the ideas of the Divine Mind, and establishes the origin of the never-ceasing course of cosmic evolution. Blending English and German thought, it concentrates the whole modern speculation on the divine world-soul.

After having set before the reader a doctrine so well elaborated, we may consider this subject as sufficiently expounded, and pass over to emanative pantheism.

According to the tenets of this theory the things which make up the visible universe are particles separated from God. Like streams ever flowing and moving on they issue from his substance. They have the same essence as God himself, but weakened and diluted in proportion as they recede from their eternal source. From this point of view emanation might seem to be a gradual process from the perfect to the imperfect, from the infinite to the finite, the very reverse of evolution. Still it is regarded as a progress to ever greater perfection. For it is by emitting from Himself numberless forms of existence, physical, cosmical, and vital, that God develops, grows and attains to the fulness of life, and it is by emitting them in succession, the one dependent on the other, that he develops gradually and in well-ordered progression. For

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 207.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 152.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 205, 206.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp., 208, 209, 242.

this reason the modern advocates of emanation look on it as a special evolution of the self-existent cause immanent in the world. God, the fountain-head of all emanation, is conceived as the infinite spirit. Matter is an effluence from Him. It is described as the self-evolved fringings of the divine eternal substance, as the visible manifestation of an invisible, incomprehensible and otherwise unknowable spirit, the outer self-unfolded, effluent, eternal robes of His infinite, omnipotent, omniscient, and unconditioned personality.

But matter is not, as was thought heretofore, the substratum of energy and prior to it; on the contrary, it is posterior to force, its simple and necessary phenomenon. Matter is the limit of all emanation. Nor is force a quality inherent in a material subject. Immediately emanating from God, it is a spiritual and increatable substance. It is the omnipresent energy of God, the divine intelligent will. The laws according to which it works are the stated or ordinary method in which God chooses to operate in nature. By its unvarying uniformity this method creates in us the impression as if force had its separate existence and its own independent laws.[1]

The forces which are active in the universe are identical with life; for all forces are convertible into one, and this one is ultimately the energy of the divine will. Life is an effluence from God.

"It is a drop from the fountain of His own being, possessing as He does and necessarily must possess, life, consciousness, mentality, will-affection, moral sense, etc. The life He possesses, being infinite, must necessarily flood the universe. As He is eternally active, His life must assume all possible forms.

"Individual organisms are but drops of spray thrown up from the heaving sea of being. Between two vast durations, a past and future, they throb with life for a brief moment, and sink again into the billows, from which new personalities are incessantly emerging.

"The totality of life in the universe is God. His life could not be infinite unless it were the life of all organisms."[2]

Such like propositions plainly go to prove that "God is all in all." There are, however, two interpretations of emanation given modern philosophers. The effluence of life, force, and matter is regarded by some as necessary, involuntary, and unconscious, by others, on the contrary, as voluntary and conscious. The first interpretation is avowedly pantheistic; but the second, which admits consciousness and will in God and hence also personality, is supposed by its defenders to be theistic.

[1] See *Theism and Evolution*, by Rev. J. S. Van Dyke, D.D. (London, Hoder & Stoughton, 1886), chaps. xiii.–xvii.

[2] *Ibid.*, chap. xviii.

Here we may end our exposition of pantheistic evolution, having passed in review the principal theories of our days which represent God either as the soul which animates and organizes the world or as the source from which all being flows in endless streams from eternity. It only remains to ask what advantages for evolution modern philosophers could expect to derive from systems which they have resuscitated from the dust of by-gone ages.

First, they tell us, that if God is taken for the immanent ground of the universe, monistic evolution is traced back to an ultimate absolutely sufficient cause and is rested on a principle of most perfect unity. For the Deity, self-existent and infinite, like a boundless ocean, contains all being and all forms of existence, and comprises all that is or can be in absolute oneness.

Secondly, by assuming God as the immanent ground of the universe, the order and beauty which nature manifests in all its realms are fully accounted for. For as God is the infinite spirit and works as the Supreme Intelligence, purpose and design, adaptation and harmony must be met with in all the effects which He produces; and as He is identical with the wide universe, the splendor of divine perfection must of necessity shine forth from each and all its portions.

Thirdly, after the main difficulties which are raised from a metaphysical point of view have been thus solved, evolution is rendered consistent with true philosophy. On the one hand, the reality of nature is maintained, and, on the other, the Deity is strongly asserted. The wonderful phenomena of the material world are explained, because their ultimate cause is inquired into, while at the same time the nature and the working of God are completely understood. The dignity and autonomy of human reason is kept intact, and yet the supremacy of the Deity is upheld. Evolution is in this way reconciled with theism and with religion. Though it denies a first cause distinct from the universe, it accepts the existence of God as the ultimate ground of all being and as the father of spirits. Nay more, evolution becomes reconciled with or rather clarifies Christianity. For doing away with blind faith in dogmas and replacing it with advanced knowledge, it discloses to mankind a divine revelation, ever going on and ever increasing in light and splendor.

It will be the object of another article to inquire whether pantheistic theories of evolution have succeeded or not in accomplishing such an astonishing task.

Rev. John J. Ming, S. J.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

RELIGIOUS persecution is a contradiction in terms. Persecution cannot be religious; or, conversely, religion cannot sanction persecution on the ground of sincere resistance to true belief. The spiritual writers have taught that it is sinful to use compulsion in the case of persons who are sincere in their unbelief; St. Francis Xavier writing, that a person would commit a sin who should even embrace what was true against his conscience.

The principle and the fact of persecution need not necessarily have anything in common; since the fact may be an accident of bad temper, while the principle can have no real existence. Take the two kinds of religious persecution, so called: that which is said to have been Catholic, and that which is said to have been Protestant. Perhaps the three best instances on the Catholic side —the instances which are most popularly believed in—are those of the Spanish Inquisition; the (purely imaginary) persecution of Galileo; and the (unquestionably true) Massacre on St. Bartholomew's Day. It may be well—so as to get at the distinction between the principle and the fact of persecution—that we briefly glance at the particulars of these scandals.

And first, as to the Spanish Inquisition. There was no "religious" persecution, nor, indeed, any persecution at all, in the principles and the objects of that tribunal. Probably, throughout the centuries, there has been no one fragment of historic fact more misconceived, more misrepresented, than the Inquisition. "Beaucoup en ont parlé," said Voltaire, "mais peu l'ont bien connue." It has been the same with the tradition about "monkish cruelty" as with most of the traditions so dear to Protestants. The modern English, of whom Gibbon said that they were "the most credulous and fanatic of any nation in Europe," have trusted to their imagination for their facts, and to their prejudice for their travesty of Catholic principles. "La nation la plus aisée a tromper, la plus difficile a détromper, et la plus puissante pour tromper les autres," as a distinguished French writer has said of England, has treated of everything Catholic in the spirit of a romancer whose sole object is to thrill his readers with sensation. "I verily believe," said Cobbett, "that there are more lies in English books than in all other books in the world put together." And certainly, as to the Inquisition in Spain, fiction and mendacity have con-

tended in equal proportion in producing a fearful picture of what *was not.*

Now, first, as to the object of the Inquisition. It was founded by a Spanish king to resist two evils in particular: (1) the treason of Judaism and Islamism, and (2) the immoralities of the Manicheans or Albigenses. Fearful dangers call, necessarily, for severe remedies; and while, on the one hand, both Judaism and Islamism combined to destroy the social order of the Spanish nation, so, on the other hand, did the Albigenses or Manicheans try their utmost to corrupt the morals of the masses by doctrines and by practices which were infamous. These sectaries taught that there were two Christs, and that it was the bad Christ who suffered on the cross; they denied the resurrection, condemned marriage, and called the begetting of children a crime. They hated the clergy, and murdered them when they could; destroyed monasteries and convents and churches. Even Mosheim said: "Their shocking violation of decency was a consequence of their pernicious system: they looked upon decency and modesty as marks of inward corruption." The Council of Lateran, 1179, affirmed: "They respect neither the churches nor the monasteries; they spare neither orphans, age, nor sex." And since it has been objected that this Council "authoritatively sanctioned persecution," let it be answered that most of the sovereigns of Europe sent their ambassadors or delegates to the Council, with a view to trying to obliterate the sect—not for its "heresy," but on the ground that it was "inimical to human nature." The canon of the Council, which certainly favored suppressive measures (though some critics have had their doubts about its genuineness) was directed against a particular evil, at a particular time, and was, therefore, disciplinary, not doctrinal. It most certainly was never binding as *de fide*, but was regarded only as a measure for public safety. All Europe combined, for the time being, to institute some such effectually coercive measures as should save society from becoming utterly demoralized, and should protect religion from professing blasphemers. The canon, therefore, of the Council could not justly be construed into "the sanctioning of a Catholic persecution," since the persecution was directed against those persons only who utterly repudiated *all* religion.

But to return to the Inquisition in Spain: are we justified in the contention that it did not, in any sense, sanction religious persecution? And first, the Inquisition was *not* primarily ecclesiastical; while secondly, it never condemned men for their opinions. It was essentially royal, not ecclesiastical; only two religious being associated with thirteen laymen; and the two religious taking always the side of mercy. It is most important to remember, as

a starting principle, that "the Catholic Church abhors blood"; that its spirit is mercy, not judgment; that no layman can be admitted to priest's orders who has ever participated in a sentence of death; and that there was no instance in Rome itself—under the sovereignty of the pontiffs—of any man being put to death by an Inquisition, or of a Jew or heretic being persecuted for his religion. Rome was always called "the Paradise of the Jews"; indeed it is the only city in Europe where Jews have been neither humbled nor ill-treated.

But our grand plea is that the Inquisition was primarily political, and only incidentally ecclesiastical. As M. Guizot has remarked, "L'Inquisition fut, d'abord, plus politique que religieuse; et destiné a maintenir l'ordre, plutot qu'a defendre la foi." Accordingly the Inquisition only punished those relapsed Jews who persisted in trying to corrupt Christians; nor did it punish them at all, if they would repent; it even allowed them to leave Spain, though it did not suffer them to remain in Spain except on the assurance that they would be harmless. What other tribunal in the world ever dealt so leniently with rebels? What other tribunal ever said to a law-breaker? "You can do penance if you will, you can frequent the sacraments, you can hear Mass; and if you do so, you shall be allowed to go scot free; but should you persist in your intention of breaking the law you shall either be banished or imprisoned." The Count de Maistre said that he considered the Inquisition "the most lenient tribunal in Europe." And the Count de Montalembert said that "its compassion and forgiveness were always pushed to the furthest possible point."

We should insist, then, that neither in object nor in process, neither in spirit nor in act, neither in its beginning nor in its ultimate development, did the Inquisition—so far as Catholic authority was concerned—sanction "religious persecution." And towards the end of its history, when the Popes ascertained that there was danger of its original purpose being abused, they requested that it should cease altogether.

(2) And now to glance for a moment at the "massacre on St. Bartholomew's day," another of the most "highly-colored" historic facts. The popular idea is that on the morning of the 24th of August, 1572, the wicked Papists in Paris arose at the sound of a bell, and put to death—and this too by preconcerted action—about four thousand most amiable non-Catholics; persons of a singularly peaceful disposition, and in every way excellent members of society; and that the Papists did this at the instigation of Catherine de Medicis, and with the approval of the reigning Catholic sovereign. Hence the verdict, "religious persecution." Now in this case there was unquestionably "persecution," but

almost the only element that was absent was the "religious." Readers of history—not of history "made up" for sectarian purposes, and perverted so as to prove a foregone conclusion, but of the whole surrounding facts of a period, in their social as well as their religious bearings—know that the hundred and fifty years of French decadence, from (about) 1560 to 1710, were the most savage and atrocious years of Christian history; politically distraught, and morally degraded, and religiously without almost any religion at all. Knowing this, we are quite prepared for enormities, not only on the side of professing Protestants, but also on the side of professing Catholics. And the massacre of St. Bartholomew was but one instance out of many in which the fiends seem to have possessed the population. There was "not much to choose" between Catholics and Protestants; all society, in public sense, being so demoralized. At the time of the massacre the Huguenots were desperately bent upon securing a Protestant succession to the throne, while the Catholics were as eagerly bent upon securing a Catholic succession; so that Catherine de Medicis found pliable instruments to hand for carrying out a purely political massacre. That the Huguenots, so called, were a dangerous menace to the State, no one who is familiar with contemporary history can entertain the smallest particle of doubt. They were also, "religiously," most exasperating. They seized upon every opportunity for insulting Catholics; even fixing a piece of ribald writing on the King's palace in contempt for the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation. Churches and abbeys were demolished or desecrated; convents and colleges were despoiled, and thousands of priests and monks were wantonly butchered in cold blood, some even being purposely buried alive. In the province of Dauphiny alone the Huguenots slaughtered two hundred and fifty-six priests, and more than one hundred religious. And this prevailing outrage—indeed it was universal—naturally led to the long "wars of religion"; wars of which religion was the pretext, but of which the impulse was half political, half fiendish.

When the Massacre of St. Bartholomew had been accomplished, the king astutely informed the Sovereign Pontiff that he had won a victory over conspirators against religion, no less than against the State and society; and so the Pope was misled into authorizing a Te Deum, believing in the simple honesty of the king. No sooner did the Pope learn the whole truth (in those days a long, conflicting process), than he shed tears, and censured the king's cruelty in permitting so vast a public crime. In this case, therefore, as in the preceding case, we see that the *principle* of persecution was wholly absent from the mind of Catholic authority. Indeed, in the year 1580, toleration had been conceded to the profession

of non-catholic novelties, while persecution had been strictly forbidden. Doubtless, the Protestant innovators were greatly disliked, and were treated very shyly, if not roughly; for that the belief of Christendom for fifteen centuries should be assailed, and the mysteries of the faith laughed to scorn, was enough to excite the population to reprisals which should be equally active and indignant. Yet the point to be impressed is that the persecution was not religious, on the side either of the Catholics or the Huguenots; the cause at heart was political; the period was demoralized, and the weapons used were those of the world and of the devil.

(3) A few words must suffice for the "Galileo controversy"—another of the misapprehended historical fragments. Galileo was *not* condemned for teaching the Copernican theory, but for treating the Scriptures irreverently, and for insolently disobeying authority. It is to Rome that we are chiefly indebted for what is called the Copernican theory. Copernicus himself delivered lectures in Rome by command of Pope Leo X.; he held there a professional chair; he published a treatise on the heliocentric hypothesis by command of and with the aid of Pope Paul III., and his work was printed and was sent forth to the world bearing the written sanction of the Pope. In the days of Galileo, the Copernican theory was taught in the Pope's own university. But now comes the *cause* of the "persecution." Galileo would persist in scandalizing the "common people" by irreverent remarks about the Scriptures. He was warned in a friendly way not to do so. He promised to desist, but broke his promise, and that, too, in a most insolent manner. Meanwhile, even Galileo, though behaving so unthankfully, received a pension for his scientific labors, and was placed in honorable position as a professor.

No judgment was given by any pontiff in regard to the Copernican theory, but only a condemnation of Galileo's private attitude in regard to the interpretation of Scripture. Protestants, who profess to honor the Scriptures, ought to be the first to honor the Popes for this reverence. But the enmity against "Popery" takes precedence of such reverence, as well as of critical care for historic facts.

Nor was Galileo "imprisoned" in the sense popularly accepted by the Protestants. He was simply sent to reside for four months in the palace of his own particular friend, who happened to be the Tuscan ambassador. "I have for a prison," he wrote, in a letter still extant, "the delightful palace of Trinità di Monte." And a little later he wrote: "Afterwards they sent me to my best friend, the Archbishop of Vienna, and I have always enjoyed the utmost tranquility."

The myth therefore of the imprisonment vanishes; while three

facts come out as clear as day: (1) The science of Galileo was approved by the pontiffs—approved, that is, in the sense of being permissible—for of course, no Pope could decree its truth or its error, no Pope being infallible upon astronomy. (2) Galileo was censured, and was sent into retreat, for his persistence in bringing the Scriptures into contempt, and not for his astronomical theories. (3) Galileo was not "persecuted" by any Pope any more than any penitent would be said to be "persecuted" who should be ordered to give his mind to contemplation, after causing grievous scandal by his impiety. Thus "religious persecution," in the case of Galileo, resolves itself into the profoundest reverence for the Scriptures, and the tenderest treatment of the offender who had made light of them.

II.

And now to turn to the other side—to the persecution of Catholics by Protestants—we have to admit at once that the persecutions, for the most part, were originated by princes, not by people. It would be unjust to say that the subjects of Henry VIII. were responsible for his wholesale murder of faithful Catholics; as it would be unjust to say that the subjects of Queen Elizabeth were responsible for the carrying out of her Penal Laws. So again, in the persecution of Nonconformists—by Queen Elizabeth's High Commission or by Test Acts—it would be unjust to accuse Anglicans of a malevolent disposition, which might be individual but which was not general. The sole ground of the persecution by Henry VIII. was his irritation in regard to the pontiff's attitude; just as the sole ground of Queen Elizabeth's Penal Laws was her determination to prefer the throne before the Faith. The subjects of those two sovereigns were, in both cases, the sovereign's victims; and as to all the bitterness which ensued, it was a natural result of party feeling; of desire of gain on the part of courtiers and placemen, and of worldly servility on the part of dependants and subordinates. Thus the *fact* of persecution, and the *principle* of persecution, must not be regarded as being identical. Horrible as were the forty years of Elizabeth's reign, in regard to the persecution of Catholics, as well as the persecution of Nonconformists, it would be unjust to say that "the Protestants" were the persecutors; it was the ruling powers which compelled the Protestants to persecute, and in those days the "ruling powers" were absolute. We must remember that until within the last century, what we now call "popular liberties"—allied with, and secured by a free press—were hardly known in the national English career. Autocracy, in more or less modified form, was the fact and the spirit of government. So that we must not blame "the people"

for being misgoverned or misled—for being compelled to do what their consciences detested.

A word here as to the persecutions by Queen Mary. In the last three years of her reign, there were hideous persecutions—though in the early part there was exceptional lenity. Can any one defend these persecutions? No; the most that can be hazarded is that provocation was at its height, and Christian endurance was at its depth. There was not much *religious* principle in these persecutions, there was the principle of expediency or self-interest. True, the Pontiff had nothing to do with the persecutions—no more than the Pontiff had to do with the plots which led to the massacre of St. Bartholomew—but a few Catholic ecclesiastics in England advised Queen Mary to make her throne secure by persecuting the enemies who would dethrone her. We must remember—and this is seldom remembered—that the Protestant faction in Queen Mary's reign was most violent; striving to dethrone the Queen; making attempts upon her life; publicly praying for her death; and publishing infamous libels upon her character. We must remember too, that the persecutors, Gardiner and Bonner, had themselves been cruelly persecuted in the previous reign; that Archbishop Cranmer and his fellow prelates were executed by those very laws which they themselves had enacted in the previous reign, and had put in practice against Anabaptists and other "heretics;" indeed, Cranmer, whom some people account a martyr, had consented in Edward's reign to the burning of six "heretics," and had actually burnt one Englishman "for heresy;" he had also burnt Joan Bocher for teaching that Christ was not incarnate of the Blessed Virgin, while as a Lutheran he had burnt Lambert and Askew for the very belief for which *he* afterwards suffered. No one, therefore, can feel pity for *him*. But all this provocation hardly excuses Queen Mary's counsellors for putting heretical rebels to death. As to Mary herself, she was not a persecutor. Sedition and apostasy drove her counsellors to severe measures, which *she* always deprecated and even abhorred. The effort of her whole life was to give back to a Catholic country the Catholic unity of which her father had robbed it. Her persecutions were forced on her—were not spontaneous. And at this point we may briefly touch on the delicate subject of "judicial equity," in regard to the persecution of any "heretic."

III.

There are necessarily two aspects of the question. The one is purely civil or political, the other, as it may *seem* to be, ecclesiastical. Let us take the political aspect first.

A sovereign—say, of a wholly Catholic country—becomes as-

sured that a "religious sect," so called, is working the disturbance of the social order, as well as the disturbance of the faith. This was the case with those sovereigns who, in the time of the Albigenses, realized the national two-fold disturbance. Provided that the new sect had been perfectly quiet, had neither sought revolution nor proselytism, a sovereign would not have been justified in "persecuting"; he would only have been justified in "converting." But, in the case of the Albigenses, all the sovereigns of Europe were agreed as to the destructiveness of their impiety. It was a duty, therefore, to pass laws for the sect's restraint. It was all the more a duty, because, being Catholic sovereigns, they ruled over united Catholic peoples. To *them* "the faith" was not what it is with Protestants, opinionative, variable, quasi-natural, but the one divine truth of God, his divine will, and, therefore, of Catholic obligation. Shall we affirm, then, that Catholic sovereigns were not justified in making laws for the protection of their Catholic subjects? This would, indeed, be a wild assertion. We can imagine every Catholic priest to cry out, "If a man burn my church because I am a Catholic priest, or sacrilegiously profane the tabernacle on that church's altar, I call upon the civil power to protect my church, to punish the desecrators of holy places, to guard my parishioners and my congregation against gross and quite unprovoked insult." Can any one deny that this is "equity?" If so, there is an end of all government responsibility in regard to all true religious liberty.

But mark, also, that, in the case of Catholic kingdoms, all Catholic subjects are "in possession." For twelve centuries had Europe been Catholic, before the Albigenses were heard of. Were the Albigenses to claim the rights of twelve centuries? Or, to bring the case nearer home, to Great Britain, *which* party, let it be asked, were "in possession" at the time of the so-called Reformation? Were Catholics in possession or were Protestants? And since Catholics were indisputably the true heirs, was it "persecution" on their part to resist robbery? With what face could Protestants assert, in the reigns of Edward VI. or Queen Elizabeth, "*We* are in possession of the ancient faith. Catholics are intruders, usurpers. *We* claim the inheritance of fifteen centuries, the right of persecuting Catholics as rebels." Who does not see that equity is on the Catholic side, revolt and usurpation on the Protestant side? Even putting Christian charity out of the question—if it were possible to do this—the Catholics could say in England, as in France, as in any country which was disturbed by the new apostasy, "*We* are the true heirs; we built the cathedrals, churches, monasteries; our faith is the inheritance of all Christian time, the rightful possession of ourselves as of our forefathers." Equity, therefore, was

wholly on the side of the Catholics. Appropriation was the "civil" crime of the Protestants, as much as it was a crime against religion.

But equity may take a larger grip or compass. While asserting that "religious persecution" is not, and never was, a Catholic principle, we must assert that the protection of Catholic peoples, equally against religious and civil wrong, is, and always was, a Catholic principle. In other words, to make laws for the protection of Catholic subjects is quite as much a duty of a Catholic sovereign as is the *not* persecuting any man for his opinions. If a king of Spain saw that by arresting the first offenders the original perpetrators of great crimes—not for their opinions but for their criminality—he could put a stop to immeasurable mischief in the future, was he not justified in arresting them? As a matter of fact, such wide policy was justified by the experiences of the after-generations. Spain enjoyed civil and religious peace, while England, France and Holland were full of outrage. The Inquisition frightened away from Spain that wicked "philosophy" which half ruined France, England and other countries. And the Spaniards at this day are less fickle, less superstitious, less the sport of every breeze of idle doctrine, than, perhaps, any other people in Europe. The Inquisition quenched enormity in its beginning; while so-called Protestantism has nurtured every error. Indeed, as several writers have remarked, even the French Revolution might have never reached such depths had an Inquisition stopped its "principles" in their beginning. England would certainly have been the better for the Inquisition in the place of the barbarous cruelties of Henry VIII. and the equally tyrannical rule of Elizabeth. The Inquisition was at once just and merciful. The tyrants of the Reformation were neither just nor merciful, and they have bequeathed infinite evils to men's souls.

Equity, therefore, can stand its trial without fear when apostasy accuses it of severity—a severity which apostasy has always practiced.

IV.

We have still to inquire, What was the essential difference in the character of persecutions by Catholics and by Protestants in what we may call their "ecclesiastical aspect?" We have conceded that Queen Mary persecuted, or rather that her counsellors did so, and we have only sought to find excuse for her on the ground that her enemies made her throne and her life insecure. But several points arise for our consideration if we would take a just view of the whole subject. Affirming, to begin with, that "religious persecution" is not, and never was, a Catholic principle—though there have been

Catholics who have retaliated, who have avenged themselves, under a provocation which was almost unbearable—we have still to be able to answer the following questions before we can form a just estimate: (1) Were crimes against religion justly regarded in Catholic ages as crimes against the state, against society? (2) Was the severity with which such crimes were ordinarily visited in excess of the ordinary punishments of great crimes? (3) Had Catholic governments a greater moral right to punish heresy than any non-Catholic government could possess? (4) Did the high *non*-Catholic authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, advocate the principle of persecution? (5) Did *non*-Catholic governments and *non*-Catholic ecclesiastics persecute more rigorously than did Catholics, the conditions being equal or nearly so; the provocations being of much the same kind?

Briefly: (1) Crimes against religion in Catholic countries might reasonably, we think, be regarded as more heinous than the same crimes in non-Catholic countries, because the Catholic religion postulates infallibility in all matters appertaining to faith; whereas, every Protestant sect repudiates infallibility and subjects all Christion doctrine to opinion. Now that one opinion should persecute another opinion is, on the face of it, ridiculous, but that divine authority should persecute dangerous opinions would be logical even though it were cruel. Add to this obvious truism the fact which has been before mentioned, that the Catholic religion is "in possession" in Catholic countries, and may therefore claim the precedence of numerous centuries in justification of its heirship of true authority, and we must admit that if Catholic governments have persecuted, they have had both logic and inheritance on their side.

(2) The severity with which heresy, apostasy, witchcraft, profanation, and such like great crimes against religion have sometimes been punished by Catholic governments has not been greater than, but only equal to, the ordinary severity exercised against "notorious criminals." In the Middle Ages severity was the rule with most governments, though it was never the rule with ecclesiastics. At one time, in France, a man who robbed on the high road was broken alive upon the rack. But then there was no necessity to rob on the high road. In the same way, if a relapsed Jew or an abandoned Manichæan chose to try to corrupt the faith of Catholics, to destroy churches, murder priests, or commit sacrilege, he chose to do what the law did not allow him to do, and had himself only to blame for the consequences. As to "severity," it was a question only of policy—and in our own day we hear it approved by learned judges; while as to "heresy"—not in opinion but in conduct; in the sense, that is, of seeking to corrupt others, and of

making war upon the religion which was "in possession"—if Catholic governments believed the Catholic faith to be divine they were excusable in seeking to enforce the divine law.

(3) And this last remark, in great measure, answers our third inquiry. Had Catholic governments a greater moral right to punish heresy than any non-Catholic government can possess? Obviously they had a much greater. A Catholic government could have nothing whatever to do with deciding what was truth, what was error. Such decision belonged only to the teaching Church, but it had everything to do with preventing wicked men from making war on the (accepted) divine truth. Do we blame Moses and Aaron for being "too severe" on Korah, Nathan, and Abiram; or do we blame Elias for ordering that the priests of Baal should be taken down to the brook Cison and slain there? *À fortiori*, under the Christian covenant—which is the substance of the Jewish shadow—we cannot blame Catholic governments for decreeing that noisy apostates should be subjected to the civil or criminal law. Such men are the declared enemies of society, much more than are thieves or calumniators.

(4) And this principle of punishing noisy apostates has been approved by almost all Protestant authorities. Regardless of the absurd inconsistency of "private opinion persecuting private opinion," Luther advocated persecution with all his might. Zwinglius taught: "Evangelium vult sanguinem." Even the gentle Melancthon defended cruelty. Cranmer positively revelled in blood-shedding. So did Latimer and Ridley, who experienced it. Sandys, Bishop of London, wrote a book to justify religious persecution. Archbishop Abbot told the king that "to tolerate Catholics would be to draw down upon himself God's wrath and indignation." Archbishop Usher taught: "To give any toleration to Papists is a grievous sin." And the Parliament of King James I. urged the king to persecution as "necessary to advance the glory of God." In Scotland, John Knox called persecution "a holy and sacred duty," and he taught: "The people are bound to put to death the queen, along with all her priests." The Scotch Parliament, in 1560, decreed death to all Catholics. And yet all these "authorities" believed in *their* own infallibility—on which ground alone they persecuted Catholics. Were such folly not vicious it would be comic. Well might Rousseau say: "Of all the sects of Christianity, Protestantism is the most intolerant and inconsistent, uniting in itself all the objections which it urges against the Church of Rome."

(5) And so we come to the last point. Did non-Catholic governments and ecclesiastics persecute *more* rigorously than did

Catholics? A big book would not suffice for the answer. The record of Protestantism is the record of persecution. Omitting Henry VIII. from the catalogue of persecutors—on the ground that he was more of an excommunicated madman than a sovereign who had any principle whatever—Edward VI.'s reign was a fitting brief prelude to the sanguinary forty years of Elizabeth. In regard to the Elizabethan era, let these questions be asked, by the way of determining the *greater* rigor of persecution. (1) Was it ever enacted in any Catholic country that every one who refused to attend the Catholic Mass should be fined; if persistent, should be banished the country; and, if returning, should be hanged? (2) Was it ever enacted in any Catholic country that no Protestant should hold any office, civil or military; that no Protestant should be allowed to wander more than five miles from his home on pain of forfeiture of lands or inheritance; that no Protestant should keep a horse worth more than five pounds, and if he did so, Catholics might take it from him? (3) Was it ever enacted in any Catholic country that if a man kept a Protestant schoolmaster for his children he should be fined forty shillings a day for the offence; if he sent his son abroad to be educated as a Protestant he should be fined a hundred pounds for the still greater offence; and that no Protestant children could inherit lands until they conformed to the Catholic faith? Was it ever enacted in any Catholic country that a Protestant should be racked ten times for his Protestantism —a punishment which was inflicted upon Father Southwell; or that a Protestant woman should be pressed to death between stones for harboring a Protestant clergyman—a punishment which was inflicted on Margaret Clitheroe? Or was it ever enacted in any Catholic country that five thousand Protestants should be sold as slaves, to be sent out to Jamaica or the West Indies—a punishment which was inflicted on Irish Catholics? But enough of this. Every one *now* knows the reality of these horrors, though for three centuries they have been omitted from Protestant histories.

V.

Let us sum up the case on both sides, in regard both to principle and to fact. We are so apt to forget in this nineteenth century that it was the custom—it was the law—for a long period to put people to dreadful deaths for irreligion. We need not argue the *principle* at this moment; it suffices that we establish the *fact;* because many persons, in these days, speak of "religious persecution" as if it were "an invention of modern Papists." Yet the English statute book should dissipate that delusion. We find that it was not until the time of George II. that the statute for burning persons for witchcraft, conjuration, enchantment, sorcery,

was repealed; and we may be quite sure that the repeal would have been much earlier, had the national sentiment sought or demanded it. A statute of James I. decreed death to "heretics," and we all know what heretics meant in his day.

Until the time of Charles II. we find it in the statute book that heretical persons should be burned. In the time of William III. if any person denied the Trinity, he was to suffer the same penalties as those indicted for apostasy. Throughout England it was the law for a long period—though happily there were instances of mercy —to burn people for sacrilege, parricide, and for arson. And in regard to this ferocity, we find only one exception, since the time of the Protestant Reformation—that is, one exception only in the British empire—and this was in Catholic Ireland. During the whole period when Catholicism was dominant in Ireland there was no penal code against Protestantism. Irish Catholics never persecuted English Protestants. But Englishmen and Scotchmen have been always conspicuous in their severity against every one whom they were pleased to account heretical.

The *fact* of severity against irreligion—or against what was accounted irreligion, on the part of many governments through many centuries, must be remembered when judging particular cases of what is called "religious persecution." The principle may be disputed as we like, but the fact admits of no dispute whatever. Queen Elizabeth's High Commission—to take this one instance only—surpassed in its severity and malignity anything that is even fabled of the Inquisition. Hume, the essayist, was of this opinion; so were de Maistre and de Montalembert. Indeed, we may go so far as to say that the "religious persecution," during the whole of the reign of "good Queen Bess," would have done credit to the inventiveness and brutality of the most typical tyrants of Turkey or Algiers. Hume relates, as showing the spirit of Elizabeth's time, that "rewards were given to any wretch who would come forward and accuse Catholics." But we need not linger on so revolting a subject. Suffice it for our purpose that "religious persecution," as a fact, though we can hardly say as a principle, has been shown to be the dominant note of English Protestantism; and it has only quite recently fallen in abeyance, in consequence of Protestantism falling to pieces.

The *principle*, however, of persecution, or say of punishing the irreligious, must be argued on broad grounds of policy. Governments may inflict temporal penalties, "on the ground of policy," just as the spiritual power may inflict spiritual penalties "on the ground of piety"—on the ground of justice both to God and man. The Catholic Church has never approved of torture for irreligion; she has approved only of penance or reparation. Governments may

do what they think best, in estimating the social value of religion, or in estimating the social harm done by irreligion; and they may attach what penalties they please to breaking their laws, which are designed for the national security and peace. This is "policy." But the Catholic Church (we need not say anything about Protestants, because they are so painfully inconsistent in their principles; believing in the necessity of *some* religion, but repudiating the living authority which can define it), thinks only of mercy towards the penitent, and of edification towards all classes of society. She abhors all religious persecution. Her Catholic kings or Catholic governments must please themselves; but if they choose to send an apostate to the stake, *she* will send a priest with him to console him, to give him Absolution and Holy Communion. The Catholic Church cannot be made responsible for such forms of judicial penalty as may seem good to Catholic sovereigns or governments. She may approve of the principle of reparation, but she is innocent of the details of retribution. Her mission is mercy and forgiveness. But if a sovereign's subjects will persist in breaking her laws, she cannot be held responsible for the consequences.

A. F. MARSHALL.

THE GROWTH AND SPIRIT OF MODERN PSYCHOLOGY.

FOR a time it was thought necessary to write—"modern" psychology, a very proper noun being supposed by this manner of punctuation to shrug at an adjective of doubtful propriety and possibly to shrink from the connection. This need is no longer felt. The advance of psychological studies within the last few years is so decided, and the interest which they have awakened so general, that the inverted commas may now be regarded as superfluous. The adjective itself is retained for the present merely to show that a transition has taken place. Psychology, in other words, has passed into a new phase, and has become to some extent a new fashion.

Those who are familiar not only with the name of the science but with its local habitations as well, are perhaps less numerous than those who watch its development from afar, inhaling psychology from the pages of romance, or catching such glimpses through the columns of the press as make them eager to know more of psychical research. From the intense absorption of the professional worker down to the curiosity of the literary eclectic, there are all grades of interest and of appreciation. But in this way or in that, for one reason or for another, well-informed people keep an eye on the movement. If the mind does not reflect upon itself, it is pleased at seeing itself reflected.

This popularity is due in a measure to certain expressions which have recently become current and which leave wide play to the average fancy. What goes on in a psychological "laboratory?" How is an "experiment" on mind conducted? What sort of apparatus, arithmetic and method is used in mental "measurements?" These are queries that prick the attention more effectually than learned dissertations on analysis, introspection or the relation of soul and body. The new terminology suggests something tangible where all has hitherto been shadowy and vague. It hints at the unveiling of mysteries which have baffled the philosophers of the past. It awakens the hope that science may eventually devise formulas and laws for the world of mind as it has devised them for the world of matter. But the wonder grows when we pass from the modern treatment of normal processes to the equally modern investigation of abnormal conditions. An innate love of the occult seeks satisfaction in all that savors of the preternatural. The in-

terest excited by the *working* of well-determined physical laws is feeble compared with that which many persons, with or without scientific training, manifest in phenomena that seem to transcend all law. Hence the apparent paradox that in an age which is in some respects so materialistic and in others so skeptical, the strange doings of mesmerism and the weird coincidences of telepathy are full of fascination. Indeed, for a large number of minds, psychology is synonymous with hypnotism, faith-cure, and excursions into the world of spirits. It is expected not only to reveal the soul's ordinary *activities*, but also to develop new psychical powers which will heighten the possibilities of life and overleap the barriers of death.

Exaggerated as these notions may be, they are less unjust than the opinion which regards the new science as a finer form of materialism or at best as a chapter in cerebral physiology. "Psychology without a soul" is a phrase often misused to brand, and presumably to crush, the audacious offspring before it is old enough to speak its defence. Nor is censure of this sort blunted when distinctions are drawn between empirical and rational psychology, between established facts and floating hypotheses, between psychology and psychologists. The science still shows its birthmarks, and these are enough to condemn it. For whatever it be, "physiological" or "experimental" or "psycho-physical," it proclaims that it is not metaphysical, and therein lies its chief depravity. Happily, such views are not held by the leaders of the spiritualistic school. The ablest among them, Mercier, Gutberlet and Farges, not only set a proper value upon the results of late investigation, but find a way to bring these into harmony with their philosophy of the soul. Spiritualism, in fact, is endangered more by the downright neglect of research than by the careful study and honest criticism of all that research brings forth. And if to-day its advocates have one thing more than another to regret it is that they have not been foremost in the psychological movement.

The first impulse came from another direction. It originated neither in materialism nor in spiritualism. The starting-point was a truth which every philosophic system must admit but which none can exclusively claim. Likewise, in its subsequent growth, the new psychology, while it advanced steadily to autonomy, by no means discarded as a whole the acquisitions of the past. On the contrary, without the development that preceded, the modern stage would have been impossible. Later on perhaps it will be easy to show that there has been no breach of continuity, and that whatever the outcome may be, the movement itself was amply justified. At present no such perspective is offered us. We are too near the beginning to see things in their true proportions.

But this beginning has an interest of its own inasmuch as it may be considered the boldest effort of exact science, an effort in which by the very nature of the problems involved, thinkers of every school are concerned.

In the outline which follows there is no attempt at a history of psychology. If reference to earlier periods of the science is made, this is only to show that its actual development is in keeping with certain laws which govern the advance of knowledge, and that in many respects the new psychology, though a transformation, is really the complement of the old.

I.

The growth of any science is mainly determined by the nature of the problems which it attempts to solve, and these in turn must vary according to the progress that is made. New results enforce the acceptance of new principles, and, conversely, each principle as it is established opens up unsuspected avenues of research. Sudden modifications affecting the essentials of a science are rare. The point of view shifts gradually, and, in some cases, imperceptibly. By additions to knowledge which in themselves seem slight, by exceptions to what had already the semblance of law, and not unfrequently by the failure of the very hypothesis which prompted investigation, readjustment is brought about, and the course of research is altered.

At times these transformations are the outcome of important discoveries which supply fresh material for observation and experiment. Not only is there a new way of knowing; there is something new to be known. This is especially true of the natural sciences, in which the accumulation of facts is often too rapid for theory and synthetic co-ordination. But such radical changes are not always necessary in order that a science may slip from its traditional mould, and have its problems recast. Different treatment of the same phenomena, implying novel interpretations, detecting hidden dependencies and devising better methods or severer tests, suffices for a thorough renovation. Knowledge in this case advances not so much by widening its domain as by mapping out more accurately its hereditary possession.

The development of psychology conforms to this law of easier transition, and its several stages are marked by different views of well-known facts. Repeated analysis of the human mind has not brought to light faculties or processes essentially diverse from those which Aristotle's keen introspection perceived. But in the course of time other meanings have been attached to mental phenomena and other relations pointed out, necessitating a change in the psychological problem.

In the Peripatetic system, both ancient and mediæval, the functions of mind were chiefly studied and valued as manifestations of the underlying soul. *Operatio* being the index of *esse*, thought and volition were understood and described in the terms of metaphysics, while the substance which they revealed took its place in the magnificent scale of being which descends from Deity to the film of "first matter."

It is true that among the later Scholastics we find thinkers who deviated from the traditional methods. Buridan, in the fourteenth century, may be fairly said to have approached the line of research which psychology follows at present, and to have enunciated principles which are now receiving experimental confirmation. But in his day philosophy was already on the decline. The thought of the age was drifting rapidly towards mysticism on one hand and the classicism of the Renaissance on the other. The old rivalry between the disciples of Aristotle and those of Plato was renewed, and a feverish activity with little or no result prevailed. Then came the storm of the sixteenth century.

The earliest psychology of England, taking its key-note from Locke, is decidedly empirical. And yet, as the "Essay" clearly shows, its dominant purpose is not the investigation of mental processes for their own sake, but the construction of a theory of knowledge. Sensations and ideas are principally studied, insofar as they represent external phenomena, and form the links between subject and object. Here, then, we have a new problem, and in its attempted solution a new version, so to speak, of conscious facts. The tendency, however, is still philosophical, and the main issue, though of undoubted importance, complicates, rather than lightens, the task of psychology. England's share in preparing the way for the modern science of mind consists, above all, in Hartley's revival of the Aristotelian theory concerning the association of ideas, the elaboration of which has been the favorite occupation of English psychologists from Hume down to Spencer and Mill.

In Germany the development of scientific psychology was still more tardy. From Leibnitz to Kant speculation is busy with those essential problems which demand a solution from every philosophical system, and becomes more and more involved as the haze of abstraction thickens and draws thought away from reality. To the German schools of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries psychology's debt is trifling. The "monads" are scarcely a substitute for the forms of Scholasticism, nor is the "pre-established harmony" much more satisfactory than the "influxus physicus" of Descartes. Inquiry into the elementary functions of mind was neglected, and if among the "popular philosophers" healthier germs occasionally appear, these certainly did not mature.

Kant himself declared that psychology could never become an exact science; first, because mathematics could not be applied to mental processes, since these must take place in time, and be limited to a single dimension; secondly, because experiment upon other minds, and the profitable observations of one's own conscious states, are equally impossible. To the first of these reasons Herbart replied with a "mathematical psychology," based on the fact that states of consciousness not only follow each other in time, but also vary in their intensity, and, consequently, are of two dimensions. This was a step in the right direction; and the principle on which Herbart insisted has survived, though his theory of mental "inhibitions," and the formulas in which they were expressed, have rather an historical interest.

Kant's second objection was more serious. We have no such instrument as a psychoscope, under which mind can be placed and examined. All that we learn, beyond mere surmise, of what passes in the consciousness of another, is revealed to us by such corporeal functions as action and speech. Whoever, on the other hand, is accustomed to introspection, must know how hard it is to seize and examine his mental states methodically. There is less difficulty in holding a drop of mercury beneath one's finger. And when, of the many who study their own minds, no two are found to agree, to what tribunal must these "private judgments" be brought? Had Kant lived to see the development of philosophy during this century, he would certainly have enjoyed some rare results of introspection.

He would also have regretted his prediction concerning psychology. For, in spite of all this philosophical oscillation, the natural sciences were forging ahead, slowly, but on definite lines. From mere description they advanced to measurement, from qualitative analysis to quantitative determination. Physics and mechanics, going hand in hand, were the first to reach mathematical exactness; but, according as their principles and methods were applied to the study of organisms, physiological research became in its own way quantitative as well as qualitative. Organ and muscle and nerve were known not only to perform certain functions, but to perform them with an energy and a velocity which might be precisely ascertained. Vital processes, in other words, even those which minister most directly to the operations of mind, were found to observe laws already verified in the inorganic world.

Again, many of the discoveries accredited to physics and physiology were, in a manner, contributions to psychology. Every advance in optics and acoustics implied a better knowledge of the conditions by which vision and hearing are determined. Newton, splitting the white ray into its colors, and Helmholtz analyzing tone, do as much for the investigation of the senses as for that of their

respective stimuli. Nor could physiology—as it studied the functions of eye and ear, as it traced excitation from periphery to centre, as it followed motor-impulse along its efferent path—do less than throw light on the intricate processes which parallel sensation, thought, and volition. Thus, while they furthered their own particular aims, these sciences approached nearer and nearer to the domain of psychology, and elaborated for its use invaluable data.

What is more, the close observation and delicate experiment of physicist and physiologist involved psychological problems. In roughly estimating his results, the scientist might, and often did, neglect the possible errors for which the organs of sense were responsible. But, for nicer determination, these variable factors, which even a perfect apparatus cannot eliminate, have to be taken into account. Not alone in astronomy is the "personal equation" of importance; allowance must be made for it wherever and whenever exact registration is demanded of the observer, or the greatest possible uniformity desired. Add to these conditions of method the fact that numerous phenomena with which physiology deals must receive their final interpretation from psychology, and it will be readily understood how the boundaries of these sciences overlap.

In a wider and more philosophical sense, biological research for a century past has been guided by principles which could not but modify the study of mind. Underlying every theory of evolution is the idea of a continuous development, resulting in gradual differentiation. To trace this process back to its earliest stages, a comparison of structure and function all along the series of organisms was required. Hence, the genetic method and, as essential to it, the comparative method. That both can be applied to the investigation of mental phenomena, and made to subserve the needs of a system, is abundantly evidenced by Mr. Spencer's "Principles of Psychology." But such forced philosophic adaptation does not lessen the value of those methods for empirical research. On the contrary, with due precaution and watchful criticism, they may become welcome aids to psychology, and indispensable aids where introspection and experiment are alike unavailing.

The outcome of these influences is that the psyche may now be regarded and studied in two ways. As the principle of mental activity in man, it is treated in "individual psychology" and, so far as is possible, by experimental methods. To its investigation in a wider sense, as embracing all forms of consciousness, "comparative psychology" is devoted. The purpose of this article is to sketch the growth, the methods and the achievements of experimental psychology.

II.

If we had to choose a maxim of the philosophers as a motto for psychological investigation, none would be more apt than *Nihil in intellectu quod non fuerit prius in sensu.* Whether with one school we hold that between the lowest and the highest mental functions there is a difference of kind or, with another school, that there is merely a difference of degree in complexity, certain it is that sensation is the starting-point of the whole process. Both those who regard ideas as products of an essentially superior activity and those who see in them nothing more than a transformation or synthesis of sense-percepts, must agree that sensation is, in some way, the elementary operation of mind. Standing thus in the gateway of mental life, it is the first to challenge examination. But there are obviously special reasons why the so-called "inferior powers" should have the priority in experimental research. To the very essence of experiment it belongs, that we should be able to vary its conditions at will, and to keep them under control. Now it is true that we cannot grasp the mind and hold it up to external agencies as we hold a mirror before a candle. We can, however, shift the candle about, that is, we can vary the objective impression and catch its reflection in the judgment pronounced by the mind and note how far impression and judgment coincide.

Ordinary experience teaches us that the coincidence is not always perfect. In "measuring with the eye," in testing with the tongue, and in discerning with the ear, we are liable to mistakes. And this tendency grows as we descend from the estimate of great differences to the perception of those that are trifling. Most of us are content to observe these facts, to note them as "curious," and to dispense with further investigation. The scientist does more. What for others is insignificant may be to him of prime importance; and what they look upon as an isolated peculiarity may give him an inkling of a more general law. So it has happened in psychology.

Two separate impressions upon the skin or upon the retina, in order to be perceived as separate, must be at a certain distance from each other; the mere fact that, objectively, there is an infinitesimal space between two points is not sufficient for their subjective distinction. Again, the discrimination of two impressions, the heaviness of two weights or the length of two lines, depends, not upon their absolute but upon their relative difference. E. H. Weber was the first to observe these facts of perception and to deduce from them the principle that in comparing external impressions, we are able to determine their relations, but not their absolute value. This was in 1834.

Calculations looking in the same direction had already been

made for other sense-functions and from other points of view. In 1738, Bernouilli established the dependence of the *fortune morale*, or pleasurable feeling, upon the *fortune physique*, the outer stimulus. A year later, Euler showed the connection between our perception of tone-intervals and the numeric proportions of the air-vibrations which are the physical cause of sound. Important, however, as these reckonings were, and necessarily bearing upon the relations between physical and psychical processes, they were not merged in any general law. The same must be said of the photometric experiments which have given Steinheil, Bouguer, Arago and Masson their scientific fame; their results were of narrow application, or at any rate were not interpreted on psychological principles. To group these loose-lying data, to give them their true significance, and to make them the starting-point of a more complete and more systematic investigation, was the task reserved for a man who united in himself the qualities of physicist, philosopher and mathematician. This man was Gustav Theodor Fechner.

In an historical chapter at the close of his "Elemente der Psychophysik," he sketches the development of the ideas embodied in that work. Imagine a man, he says, standing at a point in the circumference of a circle and looking for an object which lies within a step of him but behind his back. All round the ring he plods until at last, coming upon what he sought, he realizes that a simple turn of the head would have spared him his trouble. Such was Fechner's own experience. The purpose with which he set out was the discovery of a functional relation between soul and body, or, to express it in more general terms, between psychical and physical phenomena. This he did not conceive either as the union of form and matter or as a harmony in the Leibnitzian sense of the word, but as something analogous to physical determinations. Physics had shown the dependence of color and tone upon their external causes. Fechner sought the relation between sensation and the internal physical processes with which it is so intimately connected. In other words, his object was to find a measure for psychical phenomena, to determine their intensity as well as their quality.

This concept implied evidently a resetting of the psychological problem. As indications of the substantial soul, as reflections of the outer world, as phenomena gathered in groups or ranged in sequences according to definite laws, mental states had long been the subject of investigation; but no attempt had been made, so far as Fechner knew, to show the quantitative connections which, in the sphere of consciousness, parallel those which rule organic functions.

Inviting, however, as the problem was, its solution demanded

both reflection and research. Fechner's first idea was that soul and body, or their respective operations, might stand to each other as arithmetical and geometrical series of a lower order to those of a higher order. As a schematic illustration, this manner of conceiving the relation was not altogether unsatisfactory, but it needed sharper definition. Still clinging to the geometrical series, Fechner was led by a roundabout of thought to the conviction that the *relative* increase of the bodily *vis viva* should be taken to measure the increase of the corresponding mental intensity; and that as the *vis viva* on the corporeal side might be conceived as resulting from a summation of absolute increments, a similar summation could be assumed on the psychical side.

This view was more precise, and furnished an interpretation for certain facts which earlier investigators had discovered. But the goal was not yet reached – the psychical measure was not yet fixed upon. It was, of course, clear that a unit of measurement, such as the metre for distance or the gramme for weight, could not be found for mental quanta. We cannot say that one sensation of light is twice as strong as another, or that one sound is three times as loud as another. What we perceive is that the impressions differ in intensity or seem to be equal; that they increase or decrease; that there is an under-limit below which stimuli produce no sensation, and an over-limit beyond which an increment in their strength is not noticed. Why not make these variations of perception, with due verification and appropriate formulas, the basis of psychical measurement? This was the question which Fechner proposed to himself and, later on, to a scientific friend, from whom he received the answer that the idea was a good one and might even become a happy one provided it could be demonstrated and supported by facts. The suggestion bore its fruit. By patient research and with Volkmann's assistance, Fechner not only gathered the data which he needed, but also opened up a perspective, extending far beyond his individual attainment.

It was in the course of this quest after facts that he learned of Weber's work in the same line; and though he did not regret his laborious progress round the circle, he was so impressed with the achievements of his forerunner that he attached Weber's name to the law for which his own results are the chief basis. "Weber's law," then, was reduced to this form: equal absolute increments of sensation correspond to equal relative increments of the stimulus, or, as it has since been expressed, the stimulus-strength must increase in a geometrical ratio if the strength of the sensation is to increase in an arithmetical ratio. If, for example, one-third of an ounce must be added to an ounce in order to produce a barely perceptible difference of sensation, then two thirds must be added

to two ounces, three-thirds to three ounces, and so on, in order that an increase in weight may be noticed. The increment, in other words, must bear a constant proportion to the original stimulus with which the strengthened stimulus is compared.

We thus obtain not a direct but an indirect measure of sensation, the precision of which will depend partly on objective, partly on subjective, factors. Supposing that the physical conditions of stimulation are exactly determined, and that the attention is fully alert, it is possible to experimentally construct a scale in which each new degree of excitation will have a corresponding reinforcement of sensation. The lower limit of such a scale Fechner called the "threshold," adopting for sensation a term which Herbart had introduced to designate the entrance of a presentation into consciousness. Once we rise above this liminal quantity, we pass by "just observable differences" to a maximum beyond which objective additions are no longer remarked. The increment which a given stimulus must receive in order to effect such differences was styled by Fechner the "threshold of discrimination."

A gradation of this sort is obviously impossible without methodical procedure. If this be wanting, no skillful manipulation of apparatus, no flashes of genius or quickness of observation, can supply the defect. The next step, therefore, which followed upon the formulation of Weber's law was the adoption of the so called "psycho-physical methods." Here, too, Weber had led the way; but for wider application of the methods and especially for their theoretical discussion, Fechner's work cannot be too highly praised. Sensations of light, of tone, of pressure, and of temperature were in turn subjected to experiment, the various results expressed in mathematical terms, and even the philosophical bearings of these new data thoroughly set forth. The outcome of all this research was the "Elemente der Psychophysik," which made its appearance in 1860, just ten years after its fundamental idea took shape in the author's mind.

Fechner was far from exaggerating the merits of this work. In his preface he warns the reader that what follows is not an exposition of the elements of a science already well under way, but the presentation of an embryonic stage in what he hopes may become a science. Nor is he less circumspect in estimating the results which he obtained. Repeatedly he protests that further investigation is needed to fully elucidate the problems in hand, and even suggests how his own work may be improved. If, as is now generally thought, he overrated the importance of Weber's researches, and imputed to Weber's law a value which subsequent tests do not confirm, his right to be called the founder of the new psychology is none the less secure. Apart from what he actually

accomplished in regard to principle, method and experiment, his title rests on the fact that he marked out new lines of research which prove more and more fruitful as they are developed. Whatever may be the verdict of posterity upon the contents of the "Psychophysik," its *suggestiveness* can never be called in question.

The discussion which it provoked has proved a help rather than a hindrance to the attaining of Fechner's chief purpose. It gave him, also, occasion to bring out more clearly various points of detail which, as expressed in the original treatise, were open to misconstruction. The last, and perhaps most satisfactory presentation of his views was published shortly before his death. Out of a life of eighty-six years, about forty had been devoted to psychological research, whose stimulating effects were plainly visible when Fechner, in 1887, ceased from his labors.

Others, in fact, had entered with ardor into the same field. As early as 1862, Wundt, in his "Beiträge zur Sinneswahrnehmung," had spoken of an "experimental psychology," and in his "Vorlesungen über die Menschen-und Thierseele" (1863) had plainly outlined the course to be pursued in his later research and publication. The work, however, for which we are most indebted to him is his "Grundzüge der Physiologischen Psychologie," the first edition of which appeared in 1874. The term "physiological" is significant not only as specifying the author's treatment of mental processes, but also as hinting at differences of view between Wundt and his predecessors. In determining the relations of psychical and physical phenomena, we may confine ourselves to the two extremes, viz., the outer stimulus and the resulting state of consciousness, without attending to the physiological media which intervene. The color-sense, for instance, may be studied by experiments in which various degrees of saturation are compared with the subjective impression, but in which no note is taken of what goes on in retina, nerve and brain. Fechner's investigations were mostly of this class, and belong to what he termed the "aeussere psychophysik." It is true that his "innere psychophysik" is an attempt to account for the intermediary organic processes, but much remained to be done before this aspect of the problem could be handled in a manner befitting its importance.

Wundt's psychology is based on the idea of a complete parallelism between psychical and physiological processes. Corresponding to every function of mind there is a function of the nerve-elements. External stimuli acting upon appropriate organs and passing along definite channels, set up changes in consciousness, and, conversely, changes in consciousness modify organic activities. Nerve-processes, as such, are investigated by physiology; mental processes, as such, by pure psychology, and the

study of neuro-mental processes belongs to that border-science which is called "physiological psychology." It is evident that Wundt follows the same general line of thought as Fechner, but that at the same time he more closely determines the problem which inspired the "Psychophysik." The remarkable additions to our knowledge of the structure and functions of the nervous system which have been made during the last three decades, and in which Wundt himself has had a share, confirmed him, no doubt, in his view, and, to some extent, facilitated his task. He has, however, insisted—and with good right—that the fields of physiology and of psychology are distinct, and that the latter, though deeply indebted to the former, has a scope and a method of its own. In psychological experiment it is important that the physical conditions should be accurately fixed and varied; otherwise, definite results are impossible. Nor can an outer stimulus be properly applied, and its effects adequately understood, unless physiological factors be taken into account. But supposing these requirements entirely fulfilled, we have yet to take note of the essential element—that is, of what happens in the mind. The mental process is known to the experimentee alone, and to him only by self-observation. Were introspection infallible, its report, without further check, would be decisive. Such, however, is not the case. Deception glides so easily into our scrutiny of mind, especially where slight variations are to be detected, that rigorous control is needed in order to obtain anything like a precise record of our inner experience. This control is secured by experimental methods, and is more severe in proportion as they are perfect. Modern psychology, then, far from setting introspection aside, imparts to it a value which it could not otherwise possess, and for want of which it has served too often as a basis for inexact or erroneous conceptions.

Hence it is that immediately upon beginning its research the new science busied itself with testing its methods. By comparing the results which they severally give, by adapting them so far as may be necessary to various lines of investigation, by pointing out and if possible by eliminating conceivable sources of error, it is gradually enabled to assign each its proper value. The sharpest criticism and the nicest calculation have thus been called into requisition, and though the work is by no means at an end, it is assuring to see that one great mistake has been avoided, that, namely, of pressing on blindly without stopping to ask if the course had been rightly set.

The worth of a method may be, in part at least, determined by an examination of the principles upon which it is based. Its flaws

and shortcomings may appear on a moment's reflection, or be detected by a simple calculation. Undue assumption, neglect of minute but important factors, hasty deductions and unwarranted extension which tend to vitiate a method, or limit its application, are often exposed by critical treatment. The ultimate test, however, is experiment. Even a method that in theory is sound may be rendered impracticable by reason of special conditions that bar its application. Corrections, on the other hand, which no amount of speculation could suggest, occur at once to those engaged in experimental research. To organize such research was one of the first steps taken by Wundt.

In 1879 he opened a laboratory of experimental psychology at the University of Leipzig. The undertaking was not without its difficulties. Space was wanting, appropriation was slow, and some of the on-lookers shook their heads in doubt first as to the legitimacy of such an institute and then as to its chances of success. However, a small band of workers gathered round the director, and under his leadership made a vigorous beginning. Results were soon obtained which justified the publication of a special review, and in 1881 the "Philosophische Studien" appeared. Wundt's initiative was speedily followed in other German universities, and psychological laboratories were founded at Göttingen, Berlin, Freiburg and Bonn.

Among the earliest members of the Leipzig institute was G. Stanley Hall, who introduced the new method into this country by establishing a laboratory at the Johns Hopkins University in 1888, and by publishing the "American Journal of Psychology," which is now in its sixth volume. At present there are fifteen laboratories in the United States, and the number will be increased in the course of this year. In January, 1894, Profs. Cattell and Baldwin issued the first number of "The Psychological Review" which counts among its contributors the leading psychologists of this country and of Europe. Add to this list of periodical publications the "Zeitschrift für Physiologie und Psychologie der Sinnesorgane" edited by Ebbinghaus, of Berlin, and it will be easily seen that literature on the subject is not lacking. Finally, to encourage psychological work, an International Association has been formed, which has met twice, at Paris in 1889 and at London in 1892. Nearer home we have the American Psychological Association, which held its first meeting at Philadelphia in 1892 and its second at New York in 1893. In little more than a quarter of a century, Fechner's prediction has been fulfilled; experiment has succeeded to mere introspection, and psychology is as much at home in the laboratory as it was in the library.

III.

To the question, What has been accomplished? the simplest reply would be—*consule probatos auctores.* For those who have not such works at hand, an outline may possess some interest. But in any case, it is well to remember that the science is still in its infancy and that it makes no pretension to rival the acquisitions of older branches. Nor is it less necessary to keep in view a feature of research which is often misunderstood. Minuteness, detail, insistence upon microscopic elements and conditions—all this, most people allow, is a splendid proof of patient perseverance; but, *cui bono?* So-and-so has spent months, perhaps years, in proving that the lateral retina is less sensitive than the *fovea centralis;* some one else has written a volume on the temperature-sense, or the perception of tone, or the time-rate of various sensations. What does it all mean and what does it tell us about the soul? These are not fictitious queries. They suggest themselves naturally and are constantly proposed, not only by laymen but also by others in whom the synthetic tendency is impatient. In this respect, of course, psychology is no worse off than other sciences. What the world cares to know from the chemist, the physiologist, and even the historian is the "grand result," not the sifting and drop-by-drop accretions which it supposes. And yet as in every department of knowledge the advance is by inches more often than by miles, so in psychology the truest progress is seemingly slight. Whoever undertakes the solution of a problem which at first sight appears to be simple will generally find on closer view that it is exceedingly complex. As his investigation proceeds, he remarks that a trifling variation in the conditions of experiment produces unexpected results, each of which must be fully accounted for before he can safely pursue his way. Obliged thus to "divide and conquer," he narrows his plan of research until at the end his labor, though thorough, is spent upon a tithe of the original task. In other words, he has been busy with analysis, and the outcome is merely a thread in the fabric of science which jointly with others he is weaving. But results are multiplied, and adjusted by criticism, and reinforced by comparison till at length, by masterly synthesis, they are fashioned into theory and law.

No satisfactory generalization of this kind has yet been arrived at concerning the main problems of experimental psychology. It is now acknowledged, that in consequence of repeated tests, Weber's law possesses only an approximate value. It is verified in regard to auditory sensations, but receives little or no support from investigations on the other senses. Wundt, in this connection, calls attention to the fact, that in each sense-organ peculiar physiological conditions exist which help to explain deviations

from the law. Every one, for instance, is familiar with the phenomenon of adaptation which plays so important a part in our sensations of light and of heat. This evidently renders the "threshold" unsteady, and thereby interferes with experiment. The same must be said of after-images, of sensations that are subjective in their origin, and of the fatigue that invariably arises when an organ is exposed to stimulation for any considerable length of time. Whether by making due allowance for all these factors we get any nearer to the real psycho-physical relation is a question that future research must decide. For the present it is worth while noting that each of these peculiar conditions which threatened at first to block the course of experiment have rather widened and extended it. If adaptation foils us in the observation of visual impressions, we can turn about and study adaptation itself. If after-images are as troublesome as they are irrepressible, they can at least become subjects of inquiry, and sources, perhaps, of new knowledge. Whenever, in a word, exceptions occur that tend to invalidate a law, they must be traced to their causes and turned to the profit of science.

It is, moreover, to be remarked, that though Weber's law, in the precise form which Fechner gave it, has not been fully verified, its underlying principle admits of no doubt. We are certain that sensation does not ascend in intensity with every increment of the physical stimulus. How is this fact to be understood? At some point in its passage from the outer world to mind, the impression evidently spends part of its force. On the other hand, its appearance or non-appearance in consciousness as a new intensity depends in some way on the amount of stimulation by which it is preceded. Two explanations are thus offered which, differ as they may in some respects, imply no essential contradiction. Adopting the physiological point of view, we may say either that the neural excitation does not keep pace with the increasing stimulus-strength, but rises more slowly; or, that feeble excitations, though fully transmitted through organ and nerve, become latent in the gray matter of the brain, and have to accumulate before they can arouse sensation. In this case the mental process is directly proportioned to the stimulus to which it responds, but the stimulus itself is diminished at the periphery, along the afferent path or in the cerebral centres.

According to the strictly psychological interpretation, the phenomena which we seek to explain are merely instances of a more general law, the law of the "relativity of our conscious states." Every process of mind has its value determined, not by any absolute measure, but by its relation to contiguous processes. Besides the neural transmission, and besides the sensation as such, there

is our estimate of the sensation or, as it has been termed, the process of "apperception." It is by this process, says Wundt, that we compare different amounts of sensation, and since the basis of comparison is the sensation as presented in consciousness, our judgment must depend as well upon the actual condition of consciousness as upon that of the neural substance. Because also the excitation of the apperceptive centre implies a physiological process, this second interpretation harmonizes with the other and raises it to the rank of a higher principle by which our mental life is governed.

Both views, in the course of discussion, have found adherents and opponents. Both start out from incontestable facts to explain a phenomenon which is a complex of psychical and physiological elements. So far it is certain that neither can be exclusively accepted, and it is probable that both will be modified by further investigation. We have yet much to learn in regard to cerebral functions, and until these are more thoroughly studied, hypothesis must enter largely into our interpretation. On the other hand, what we call "consciousness" includes a great deal more than mere sensation. Feelings in the stricter sense of the word, associations, logical combinations, acts of memory, attention and will, all have their share in our mental "structure," and all must be accounted for before psychology can venture on its final generalization.

Some progress has already been made in the experimental investigation of these higher processes; but it seems advisable here to render our description of them more intelligible by a brief outline of the course pursued in obtaining such results. A thorough acquaintance with psychological methods is to be gained only by personal experience in the laboratory; and if the present sketch is no attempt at a pen-picture, it may serve to show how the difficulties of research, though numerous, are in a measure overcome.

Once a problem is well defined, the first step towards its solution is the arranging of physical conditions. The stimulus must be kept under exact control, its quantity ascertained, its constancy within necessary limits secured, and its variations precisely determined. For this purpose apparatus is needed which must be delicate in proportion as the work approaches a maximum of niceness. In some lines of experiment, instruments ready-made are found in the ordinary physical or physiological cabinet; in others, special contrivances are devised to meet special requirements of the problem. And in all cases the arrangement is considered more perfect according as the apparatus, by acting with mechanical precision, excludes the uncertainties of manipulation. A candle-flame, for example, is not the best source of light, nor would the

highest skill of a pianist ensure a perfectly regular sequence of sound. Experiment, to be worth anything, must adopt more accurate means.

Of equal, and perhaps of greater importance, is the selection of an experimentee. Not every intelligent or educated person will answer this purpose. The subject, potentially at least, must be capable of close introspection ; that is, if he does not already possess this habit, he should be able to acquire it by a reasonable amount of training. For it is intended not that stimulation shall sink silently into the depths of his consciousness without eliciting a response, but that he shall describe with the greatest possible accuracy the effect of the impression upon his mind. In drilling the novice, however, certain errors have to be avoided, which are occasioned at times by an over-anxiety to get uniform results, or results that bear out a preconceived notion. He should not be given the *à priori* idea that a standard exists to which his own report must correspond, nor should he be urged on by practice to become a machine. Failure to act mechanically is a defect in a piece of apparatus ; in the subject of experiment it hints at some particular feature of consciousness which in itself demands explanation.

Proper apparatus and capable subjects are essential requisites for successful work. But in actual experiment many details have to be taken into consideration in order to ensure methodical precision. In most cases, for instance, the experimentee must be isolated as far as possible from all disturbing influences, so that the full force of attention may be given to the impression which is under investigation. Hence the use of the " dark room " in optical work, of the " still room " in experiments on hearing, and of many more delicate contrivances which not only exclude impressions upon organs other than the one which is being tested, but also limit the action upon a particular organ to a single stimulation. Again, in certain lines of work a choice must be made between informing the subject of what he is to expect or to observe, and leaving him in partial ignorance. The latter plan is often preferred because it frees the observer from bias, and checks the tendency to routine. In fact, this choice implies something more than a methodical precaution ; it involves the problem as to how far anticipation affects our estimate of an impression. Another question that presents itself at the outset is this : should the experiment be repeated a great number of times upon two or three subjects, or should a score of subjects be tested with fewer experiments for each ? If the first plan be followed, the results will approach constancy more and more, and may be regarded as typical in certain kinds of research. But when we have reason to believe that individual dif-

ferences will be considerable, these can be reduced and something like an average obtained only by increasing the number of experimentees. It need not be added that the time required for getting satisfactory results will depend in great measure upon the way in which this question of method is answered.

Let us suppose that with due regard to these and other details, a piece of work has reached a stage at which the facts observed point to a definite conclusion. If we look over the record of these experiments all that we see at a glance is a succession of ledger-like pages covered with rows of figures, with here and there a mysterious sign or a brief annotation. To the unpracticed eye these protocol symbols mean nothing; nor do they mean much more to the psychologist until by proper interpretation their teaching is set forth, their variation ascribed to changing conditions, and the fact which they enunciate traced up to its cause. To obtain results by proper methods and to give such results a just interpretation—these are the main elements of research and the means of adding to our scientific knowledge.

The psychological problems which have thus been handled are by no means exhausted; yet their treatment is of sufficient interest to justify at least a hasty review.

1. *Analysis of Sense-Perceptions.*—Impressions made upon our organs of sense give rise not only to single sensations but also to those more complex states which the Germans designate as *Vorstellungen*, and which we with less precision call "presentations." Habitually we regard these combinations as simple processes, so closely are they welded by experience and so rapidly, almost automatically, are they formed. On nearer examination, however, we discern in them a large number of elements brought together in a variety of ways and under conditions which usually pass unnoticed. Nor are these elements and conditions identical for all our perceptions. In visual presentations, for instance, spatial relations play the leading part; in auditory presentations the time-element predominates; while in tactile and motor presentations both space and time are involved. One set of impressions is simultaneous, another successive. One is easily localized, another scarcely hints at the place whence, objectively, it proceeds.

Considerable progress has been made in the analysis of presentations whose elements are furnished by the highly developed senses of hearing and sight. The nature of musical intervals, of rhythm, harmony and melody, has been carefully defined. Still nicer work has been done on the visual field, the perception of motion, distance and perspective, and the curious phenomena of optical illusion. But in regard to taste and smell and *a fortiori* in regard to hunger, thirst and fatigue, our knowledge is meagre and

unsatisfactory. So that while the mental ordering of impressions that chiefly acquaint us with the outer world, has been thoroughly investigated, the nature of those perceptions which are immediately connected with the sustenance of the organism or arise from systemic conditions, is still quite obscure.

2. *The Study of Attention.*—Objects within the field of vision are more or less clearly seen according to the retinal points which they impress. If their images fall upon the lateral retina, the corresponding objects are indistinctly seen. The object which darts its ray to the *fovea centralis* is perceived with greatest distinctness. Something analogous takes place in the mind. Of the sensations, perceptions, thoughts or feelings that enter at a given moment into the mental content, but one is at the focus of attention; the rest are stationed in the outlying area of consciousness. By what means is this mental fixation brought about? Under what conditions does it veer round from one image to another? How far does it yield to the force of external impressions or the drift of association, and how far is it under the control of the will? Is it steady or fluctuating? Does it weary with anticipation, grow firm with long repetition or spring up at sudden surprise? The answers both qualitative and quantitative that experiment has given to these questions, are among the best contributions to our knowledge of mind.

3. *The Succession of Mental States.*—That feelings and ideas group themselves in definite ways, and that if not interfered with, they follow each other in a certain order through consciousness, are facts which have long since been reduced to the "laws of association." Succession, however, implies time, and time can be measured. It is possible, then, to determine in some way the duration of mental processes, to estimate how long it takes to see, to hear, to judge, to choose. It would, of course, be useless to attempt measurements of this kind upon our ordinary speed of thought. At times we think with remarkable rapidity; at others, our ideas seem to drag; and again when a choice is necessary, the swarming of ideas is a cause of hesitation. The conditions, therefore, of the problem must be simplified to such a degree that the whole force of the attention is centred upon a single impression or limited to a small number of impressions. We may then determine, not how long it takes the mind habitually to act, but how quickly it can act under the most favorable conditions. This action, moreover, cannot be directly measured. As impressions reach the mind through the organism, the response must travel back through some organic process in order that it may be registered. Knowing the time-point at which the impression was given and that at which the mental process is recorded, we have an interval which is filled

up with a series of actions, partly physiological and partly psychical, and which is usually called the "reaction-time." This interval, in its totality, is easily measured. We wish, for instance, to know how long it takes to hear. The same stroke of the hammer that produces the sound closes an electric circuit and sets the chronoscope in motion; the experimentee, on hearing the sound, opens his telegraph-key, breaks the circuit and brings the chronoscope to rest; the dial shows that so many thousandths of a second have elapsed. But meanwhile a number of processes have taken place. From the ear, the sound-stimulus has sped along the nerve to the brain, acts of recognition and volition have been performed and a motor impulse has hurried back, forcing the muscles to contract. Were all the physiological factors in this plexus accurately measured, a simple subtraction would give us the time occupied by the psycho-physical process. In point of fact, however, we are not yet certain as to what takes place in the brain and much less as to the duration of its functions. What we measure in this case is the mental act plus the afferent, central, and efferent neural transmissions.

But this measurement serves a purpose. Given the time required for a single perception, it is possible to determine by further experiment the time taken up by more complicated mental operations. When the subject is obliged to choose between two impressions, to perform a calculation or to associate an idea with the present perception, his reaction will naturally be longer than when he merely hears a sound or sees a light-flash. The record will show a certain time-surplus, and this is properly assigned to the additional process of mind.

In all such experiments, we may expect a considerable variety of results, according to the method employed, the amount of practice, the degree of concentration and the individual constitution. Partly by multiplying the experiments, partly by accounting for their variations, something like uniformity is obtained. But over and above the determination of the mental time-rate, these researches have brought to notice many of those subtle conditions whose influence upon consciousness is as important as it was hitherto unsuspected. And though the labor of analysis is tenfold increased, it is certain that the value of the corresponding synthesis is proportionately enhanced.

4. *The Time-Sense.*—The investigations just mentioned are a reply to the question—what is the time of our thought? Conversely, we may ask, what is our thought of time? The one problem turns upon the duration of mental acts; the other upon the character of the act by which we estimate duration. In a large way, we all know that objectively equal time-lengths seem longer

or shorter according to our circumstances. On the clock-face an hour is always sixty minutes; but in grief or suffering or suspense, each minute for us is an hour, while for our seasons of pleasure and joy, the hours themselves are too swift. The subjective factors in our estimate always overween when they are strengthened by emotional states. If these latter be excluded, we are more likely to coincide in our time-judgment with the objective measure. This judgment, however, in order to be accurate, supposes a due concentration of the attention, and as this cannot be held steady through long periods, comparatively brief stretches are alone available for experiment. It is safer, in other words, to compare seconds with seconds than hours with hours. Hence the problem of the time-sense may be restated as the "valuation of short intervals."

Under these limitations, research has of late made remarkable progress, establishing, along with other peculiarities of our time-estimate, the noteworthy fact that shorter intervals are overrated while longer intervals are underrated. This result becomes in turn the starting-point of fresh investigation from which we may hope a clearer insight into what is still one of the most intricate psychological problems.

5. *Feelings and Emotions.*—Here we come upon psychical processes which seem at first sight to elude experiment. Largely as they enter into everyday life, and familiar as they are in various forms, they mock at qualitative introspection, to say nothing of quantitative determination. We never mistake a thrill of gladness for a pang of sorrow nor the promptings of hatred for those of affection; yet sharp-eyed analysis is needed to tell us in what these opposite feelings precisely consist. That they color our thought and affect our volitions and often assert their influence in our outward actions, is also a fact of experience that complicates the problem while it presses for an explanation. It is true that these states are shared in, more evidently than the intellectual activities, by the organism, and from this it might be inferred that their nature could be more easily determined. Emotion when it is freed from restraint reflects itself in our exterior, in the flash of the eye, the quivering of the lips or the flush that spreads over the face. But these outward signs are too vague to form the basis of exact mensuration. They tell us of anger, but not of its degree, of fear and shame and delight, but not of their intensities.

In spite of such difficulties, investigation has been busy, since the first decade of this century, upon the relation between emotion and its bodily expression. From Bell (1806) to Darwin (1872), a lively interest was manifested in the subject, and much valuable material accumulated, which however is chiefly of an

anatomical and physiological character. More attention has been recently paid to the psychological features of emotion, without of course neglecting its externalization. Respiration, heart-beat, and increase of volume in different members of the body, have each in turn served as indices of the parallel feeling. The latest researches are by Lehman and appear in his work—"Die Hauptgesetze des Menschlichen Gefiühlsleben" (1892). By combining the three classes of movement referred to above, this author has succeeded in giving a graphic representation of various emotions so far as they affect the respiratory and circulatory processes. If we conceive mental calm as a straight line or as one whose rhythmic curvings are as regular as the normal pulse allows, any brusque emotion will trace a sudden excursion above or below the line to an extent that depends upon the strength and nature of the emotion. What is more, the curve will vary according to the kind of ideas that arouse or accompany the most moderate feeling; and no other psychological experiment is so striking as this, in which we can literally follow the "train of thought," or note the ebb and flow of emotion.

In a summary like this it is impossible to do justice to individual psychologists whose researches on particular subjects have been epoch-making for the science. Beginning with the work of Ebbinghaus on memory and that of Goldscheider on the temperature-sense, a long list of names might be added to the roll of honor. Nor have there been wanting in these latter years men who, like Müller and Münsterberg, James, Külpe and Ladd, have proposed to set psychology on new theoretical foundations or thoroughly to revise its methods. All such movements, be their ultimate value what it may, are signs of earnestness and activity. But there is one means by which, without lengthy description, an idea may be given of the proportions which psychological research has attained. Glancing over the *literature* of the science for four years only, we find that the number of publications dealing in one way or another with problems of mental life was, in 1889, nine hundred; in 1890, thirteen hundred and twenty-five; in 1891, eleven hundred and seventy-one; in 1892, eleven hundred and fifty-eight—an average of three publications *per diem.*

These figures have an import of their own which needs no comment. But they have also, by implication, a meaning which shows the trend of the science: they are the effect of specialization and they compel specialization. Argue as we may about the pedagogical value of specialized studies, we cannot rule out the fact that they are the main-spring of scientific progress. That steady differentiation which has given to the various empirical branches a certain independence has affected philosophy as well. Logic,

psychology, and ethics tend more and more towards autonomy, as special research widens out their respective domains. And as new workers crowd into the field, the activity of each, in order to be productive, must be restricted, and make up in depth what is apparently lost by the limitation of surface.

It does not follow, however, that the specialist in psychology or in any other science can afford to lose sight of those relations which, on a higher plane, bind all branches of knowledge to unity, or to dispense with that broader education which makes his after-building secure. But it does follow that the preparatory training must be revised so as to balance by its generality the specialization which is to come later on. How the revision shall be accomplished is a problem for pedagogics. Any scheme of education that is proposed as a solution must keep in view not only the abstract bearing of science upon science, but also the capacity of those who are educated. To train the mind without a knowledge of the mind is absurd. To force it, irrespective of its aptitudes, into a rigid mould, is dangerous. And it is equally fatal to adopt a system in which the powers of observation, of concentration, and, above all, of independent thinking, are not adequately developed. We are thus brought round to a new and more practical aspect of psychology—its application in the school-room. In whatever fashion the teacher performs his task, he is, consciously or unconsciously, applying psychological notions. Is there any reason why these should be wrong rather than right, vague and tentative when they might be precise and methodical? It cannot be said that modern psychology has, as yet, rendered to pedagogics the full share of usefulness which the relations of the two sciences would lead us to expect. But noteworthy advance in this direction has been made especially by some of our American psychologists. Further results will doubtless prove that the experimental study of mind may be turned, indirectly at least, to the profit of all the sciences, and that whatever psychology owes them may, in time, be amply repaid. In rendering this practical service, based upon exact and painstaking research, the new psychology not only helps us to know the mind but also helps the mind to know. In both respects it has progressed; in neither can it be blamed for being modern.

E. A. Pace.

Catholic University.

INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

"Sic Vos Non Vobis."

(SECOND ARTICLE.)[1]

IT is probable that few students of American history can study the bibliography of the Algonquian Languages, without becoming deeply interested in its suggestive pages.

In these pages may be found the index to events related, which are essentially connected with the history of North America, especially during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

And it is probable also, that, to many, the true nature and bearing of these events have been imperfectly understood, and by others overlooked or forgotten.

Whether we follow the eminent compiler of the bibliographies of the Indian languages to the cantons of the Indian nations west of the Mississippi whom he visited while engaged in his work and amongst whom exposure and unsuitable nourishment weakened his system; whether we watch him while searching the libraries of sympathetic American bibliophiles, or while enjoying the cheerful co-operation and *bonhomie* of the custodians of the hierarchical, the collegiate, the conventual, the parochial, and the missionary archives of Canada; or whether we wonder at his courage and industry while exploring the literary vastness of the British Museum, or while searching the archives and libraries of Continental Europe for some book or manuscript he felt sure was extant, but of which he had but slight clue to work upon for its discovery; it will be difficult to withold our sincere tribute to his self-sacrificing energy and to express our gratitude for the aid he has rendered in the development of this important field of American literature, by placing so much reliable data within our reach.

"The Algonquian speaking peoples," writes Mr. Pilling, "covered a greater extent of country, perhaps, than those of any other of the linguistic stocks of North America, stretching from Labrador to the Rocky Mountains, and from the Churchill River of Hudson Bay to Pamlico Sound in North Carolina; and the literature of their languages is by far the greatest in extent of any of the stocks north of Mexico, being equalled, if at all by only one

[1] See The American Catholic Quarterly Review, for October, 1893.

south of that line, namely the Nahuatl. Probably every language of the family is on record, and of the more prominent, extensive record has been made."

In two, the Massachusetts and the Cree, the whole Bible has been printed, the former by the way being the first Bible printed upon this continent. In two others, the Chippewa and the Micmac, nearly the whole of the scriptures has been printed, and portions thereof have appeared in a number of others.

In the Abnaki, Blackfoot, Chippewa, Cree, Delaware, Micmac and Nipissing, rather extensive dictionaries have been printed, and of the Abnaki, Nipissing, Blackfoot, Chippewa, Cree, Massachusetts, Illinois, Montagnais and Pottawotomi, there are manuscript dictionaries in existence.

Of grammars, we have in print the Abnaki, Blackfoot, Chippewa, Cree, Massachusetts, Micmac and Nipissing, and in manuscript the Illinois, Menominee, Montagnais and Pottawotomi. In nearly every language of the family, prayer-books, hymn-books, tracts, and scriptural texts have appeared, and several of them are represented by school-books of various kinds, *i.e.*, primers, spellers, and readers; and in one of them, the Chippewa, there was printed in 1840, a geography for beginners.

The Algonquian bibliography embraces 2245 titular entries, of which 1926 relate to printed books and articles, and 319 to manuscripts.

Of these 2014 have been seen and described by the compiler—1850 of the prints and 164 of the manuscripts, leaving as derived from outside sources 231, 76 of the prints and 155 manuscripts.

Of those unseen by the compiler, titles and descriptions of probably one-half have been received from persons who have actually seen the works and described them for him.

In addition to these there are given 130 full titles of printed covers, second and third volumes, etc., all of which have been seen and described, with one exception by the compiler; while in the notes mention is made of 243 printed and manuscript works, 146 of which have been seen and 97, derived from others, mostly printed sources.

The chronological chain begins with Marc Lescarbot's "Histoire de la Nouvelle France,"[1] Paris, 1609, in which examples are given of the Souriquois-Etchemin, of the Abnaqui nation, language, and it ends with a notice of the linguistic studies of Mr. Alexander Francis Chamberlain,[2] and his treatise on the language of the Mississaqua Indians, in 1891.

---

[1] For a description of Lescarbot, see succeeding pages.

[2] *Notes of the Customs, History and Beliefs of the Mississaquas*, by A. F. Chamberlain, B.A. Toronto. 1891.

Now although nearly three centuries intervene between the beginning and the ending of the chain, the Souriquois-Etchemins are still constituents of the Abnaqui nation, and with the Mississaqua nation were contemporaries before Marc Lescarbot's time. The homes of these nations are within the Dominion of Canada, and mostly in the same localities occupied by them before the white man had landed upon their soil. It will be remembered, that when the Iroquoian Confederacy sent a gigantic fleet of war canoes against the Chippewa nation on Lake Superior in the seventeenth century, the cantons of the Mississaqua nation were traversed by the New York invaders and literally wiped out of existence, as was supposed, but they survived.

The nations of the Algonquian confederacy whose languages are comprised in this work are the Abnaki, Acadian, Algonquian (distinct), Arapaho, Atsina, Blackfoot, Brotherton, Cheyenne, Chippewa, Cree, Delaware, Etchemin, Hudson Bay, Illinois, Kaskaskia, Kikapoo, Leni Lenapé (Delaware), Long Island, Maliseet, Manhattan, Mascoutin, Massachusetts, Menominee, Miami, Micmac, Mississaqua, Mohegan, Montagnais, Montauk, Munsee, Nanticoke, Narragansett, Naugatuck, Nehethawa, New England, New Jersey, New York, Nipissing, Norridgewock, Ottawa, Pampticough, Pamunkey, Passamaquoddy, Pennsylvania, Penobscot, Peoria, Pequot, Piankashaw, Pottawotomi, Powhattan, Quiripi, Rhode Island, Sac and Fox, Sankikani, Satsika, Savanna, Shawnee, Sheshtapoosh, Skoffie, Souriquois, Unquachog, Virginia, Wapanoc and Wea.

Besides these there are tributary peoples of the national stocks, many of the names of whom are more familiarly known than the names of the parent stocks, and these are comprised in the languages of the Abbitibi of the Cree, Blood Indians of the Blackfoot, Cahokia of the Illinois, Caniba of the Abnaki, Esopus of the Munsee, Fall Indians of the Atsina, Fox of the Sac and Fox, Gaspesian of the Micmac, Gros Ventre of the Atsina, Knisteneau of the Cree, Lenapé of the Delaware, Mareschit of the Maliseet, Melicete of the Maliseet, Minsi of the Munsee, Moose of the Cree, Moosonee of the Chippewa, Mountaineer of the Montagnais, Nantic of the Narragansett, Natic of the Massachusetts, New Sweden of the Delaware, Ojibwa and Ojipwe of the Chippewa, Old Algonkin of the Algonquian, Openango of the Passamaquoddy, Piegan of the Blackfoot and Satsika, Plymouth of the Massachusetts, Quoddy of the Passamaquoddy, Sahkey of the Sac and Fox, St. Francis of the Abnaki, Saint John of the same, Sauk of the Sac and Fox, Salteux of the Chippewa, Shinwank of the same, Soto of the Chippewa, Stockbridge of the Mohegan, Tamarois of the Illinois, Tarratine of the Abnaki, Twightwee of the Miami and Unami of the Delaware.[1]

[1] *Algonquian Bibliography*, preface viii.

Here are designated more than one hundred distinct nationalities, comprising the circle of the Algonquian League as it existed before the advent of the European on North American soil, whose languages are embraced in this bibliography.

How long these languages had existed prior to the arrival of Jacques Cartier, in 1534, it would be impossible to state with any degree of positive certainty. But it was due to the intelligence of this French navigator that the existence of some of the languages of the North American Indian nations was first made known to the people of the Old World when he published the account of his voyage up the River Saint Lawrence, in Paris, more than three centuries and a half ago.

At the epoch of the advent of the European, the entire native population of the North American Continent was Pagan.

The inception of this Indian bibliography, which, in the Algonquian circle alone, comprises, as stated, 2245 titular notices, was coincident with the crusade of the Europeans for the conversion of these peoples to Christianity.

A scrutiny of Mr. Pilling's chronological index discloses the fact that 122 of the titular entries of the Algonquian bibliography relate to the seventeenth century, 213 to the eighteenth century, and 1910 to the present or nineteenth century. Of the 112 of the seventeenth century, 68 relate to Indian nations who had previously and during that century dwelt upon the soil and contiguous thereto, known in American annals as New England, but who are now extinct.

Of the 213 prints or manuscripts originating during the eighteenth century, nearly one-half the number have relation to extinct nations who had previously dominated the soil of New England, Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the islands contiguous to the Atlantic coast. Of the 1910 works or manuscripts originating during the present century, 372 relate to Indian nationalities, who at a remote period were lords of the soil of the countries mentioned above, and whose necrology is a part of the history of the American Republic.

Of the 319 manuscripts recorded by Mr. Pilling and forming a part of the Algonquian bibliography, most of which he has seen and minutely described, the greater number of them are in the handwriting of scholarly and distinguished Catholic missionaries, which were written during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and in the languages of Algonquian nations, as manuals, scriptural works, sermons, translations of prayers and litanies, instructions for the administration of the sacraments, the examination of conscience, the acts of contrition, faith, hope and charity, prayers for confession, before and after communion, and doctrinal explana-

tions of the faith these holy men sought to inculcate in the minds of their impressionable neophytes, designed for practical use for themselves, or for the assistance of those who might succeed them in their sacerdotal functions. For the more intelligent assistance of those who might succeed to their missionary work, they compiled grammars, vocabularies, dictionaries and linguistic treatises of the vernacular of those whose spiritual care their successors were to assume.

Partially hidden, it may be claimed, as these precious manuscripts have been for more than a century, their existence and their import has been known to comparatively few American writers. They have now been collocated by Mr. Pilling, and their contents minutely described.

It is known that the documents piled *en masse* in the Tower of London, when recently arranged and indexed, so that they might be examined, proved upon inspection to be of such a nature, as to change the face of the history of the epochs to which they related.

It is not claimed that the French manuscripts stored away in Canada will essentially affect the status of North American history, as it has been written; but they are calculated to shed new light upon that portion of this history which relates to the Catholic Church. And no writer of American history in the future should ignore their existence or fail to explain their significance.

As the greater portion of the bibliography of Algonquian Languages comprises the description of printed works, we shall briefly consider such of these as relate to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries first and consider the manuscripts of the same epochs subsequently.

In doing so we shall group these works according to nationality in their chronological order, which will include the French, the Dutch, the German and the English.

The earliest of the French, as stated, is Lescarbot, which is noticed as follows:

"Lescarbot Marc, Histoire de la Nouvelle France, contenant les navigations, decouvertes, et habitations faites par les Francais és Indes Occidentales et Nouvelle France souz (*sic*) l'aveu et authorité de nos Rois Tres Chrestiens, et les diverses fortunes d'iceux en l'execution de ces choses, depuis cent ans Jusques à hui. En quoí est comprise l'Histoire Morale, Naturelle et Geographique de ladite province: Avec les tables et figures d'icelle. Par Marc Lescarbot Advocat en Parlement, Témoíne oculaire des choses ìcí recitées.

Multa renascentur quæ iam
Decedere cadéntque.

A Paris chez Jean Milot, tenant sa boutique sur les degrez de la

grand salle du palais, 1609, pp. 956." The linguistics in this edition are as already described.

Subsequent editions of Lescarbot are also noticed. This author, it should be stated, was a pronounced opponent of the Catholic missionaries. Claude Duret in his "Thresor de l'Histoire de Langues," Paris, 1613, reprints Lescarbot's linguistics. Champlain is noticed as follows:

CHAMPLAIN SAMUEL DE. Les voyages de la Nouvelle France occidentale dicte (sic) Canada, faits par le Sr. de Champlain Xainctongeois, Capitaine pour le Roy en la Marine du Ponant, et toutes les Descouvertes qu'il a faites en ce païs depuis l'an 1603, iusques en l'an 1629. On se voit comme ce pays à esté premierement decouvert par les François, sous l'authorité de nos Roys tres Chrestiens, iusques au regne de sa Majesté à present regnant Louis XIII. Roy de France and de Navarre, etc. Avec un Catechisme ou instruction traduicte du François au langage des peuples Sauvages de quelque contrés, avec ce qui s'est passé en ladite Nouvelle France en l'année 1631. A monseigneur le cardinal duc de Richelieu. A Paris, chez Louis Sevestre, ruë du Meurier prés la Porte, 1632. Small quarto, pp. 330.

The linguistic examples in the first edition as quoted above, are in the Montagnais language, by Pére Enemond Masse, S. J., one of the earliest of the Jesuit missionaries of the seventeenth century. Father Masse's experience as a missionary to the North American Indians, was at first marked with many adventures and trials, which he underwent at the hands of the English.

In 1610 a fund was raised to sustain a mission in Acadia; and Fathers Peter Biard and Enemond Masse, both Jesuits, were appointed to this mission. Opposition on the part of two Huguenots who had an interest in the vessel in which they had intended to embark, prevented their departure.

A French lady, Antoinette de Pons, Marquise de Guercheville, who had been active in raising means for this missionary work, purchased the interest of the Huguenots in this vessel and cargo and assigned these shares for the benefit of the proposed mission.

The trading vessel having on board the two Jesuit missionaries, Biard and Masse, sailed from Rouen in January, 1611, and after a voyage of four months arrived at Port Royal.

The missionaries remained in the vicinity two years, enduring hardships and insults from Biencourt, supercargo and joint owner, with the mission, of the enterprise.

This Frenchman acted brutally and even prevented the priests from leaving the settlement. Madam de Pons being apprised of this state of affairs, obtained an extensive grant of territory extending from the St. Lawrence to Florida, from Louis XIII., and

purchased the rights of the grantee of Port Royal. Having thus acquired a domain entirely under her own control she resolved, "to establish a mission for the conversion of the Indians, where Catholic priests could begin the good work unhampered by any claims or interference of proprietors or merchants, and fitted out a vessel at Honfleur under the command of the Sieur de la Saussaye. It carried Father Quentin and Brother Gilbert du Thet with thirty persons who were to winter in the country.

"The vessel sailed from France, March 12, 1613, and putting in at Port Royal in May, took Fathers Biard and Masse on board, ran along the coast and entered a fine harbor on the eastern shore of Mount Desert Island.

"Here the missionaries landed and planting a cross, offered the holy sacrifice of the Mass, calling the port Saint Sauveur." A fine location for a settlement was selected and the missionary expedition landed. M. de Saussaye gave no attention to building defensive works but cultivated the fertile soil, some habitations were built on shore and the vessel remained at anchor in the harbor. The Indians were friendly and appearances favorable. One day in September while M. de Saussaye was temporarily absent, an English vessel appeared off the harbor, and immediately opened fire on Madame de Pons's vessel, which was forced to surrender. Brother Gilbert du Thet was mortally wounded, carried ashore, and died the following day. The attacking vessel was commanded by Samuel Argall, deputy governor of Virginia and an English buccaneer of high renown; he robbed de Saussaye's desk of its papers and effects, and plundered the settlers. Putting Father Masse and fourteen Frenchmen in a small craft he set it adrift. On the ground that the French were intruders, he not only destroyed Saint Sauveur but subsequently Port Royal and the port on Ste. Croix Island. Argall's vessel on which were Fathers Biard and Quentin met with storms and was driven to the Azores, whence the survivors of the missionary expedition finally made their way to France.[1] Father Masse and companions were picked up at sea and carried to England, and soon after reached France.

The missionary again left his native country, in 1625, for Canada, and labored with the Algonkins and Montagnais till Quebec was taken in 1629, and he was, a second time, taken prisoner, and carried to England, but finally allowed to return to France. In 1633, he again returned to Canada, and was assigned to the care of the Montagnais Indians with whom he remained for thirteen years, and died in 1646, in his 72d year.

---

[1] *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, p. 222–23. See also the interesting story of this mission in the works quoted by Dr. Shea's foot note.

The next in the series of French works noticed is as follows:

"Le Jeune, Pêre Paul. Relation de ce qui s'est passé en La Nouvelle France en l'année 1633. Envoyée au R. P. Barth Jacquinot Provincial de la Compagnie de Jésus en la Province de France, par le P. Paul le Jeune de la mesme Compagnie, Superieur de la residence de Kebec." (*sic.*)

"A Paris chez Sebastian Cramoisy rue S. Jacques, aux Cicognes, 1634, avec privilege du Roy." In which are examples of prayers in Montagnais.

The "relations" of the same missionary for the succeeding year to the same Father Superior, and from the same press in Paris, 1635, contain sermons in the Montagnais language with French interlinear translation.

The "relations" for the succeeding year, by the same Father Superior of the Jesuits at Quebec, having similar examples, was printed, "En Avignon, de l'imprimerie de Jacques Bramereau, imprimeur de sa Sainctete, de la Ville, et Université. Avec permission des superieurs. 1636.

In "Relation de ce qui s'est passé en la Nouvelle France en l'année 1642–1643," to Rev. Jean Filleau, Provincial of the Jesuits in France, by Father Barth Vimont S. J., Superior at Quebec, is a letter in the Ottawa language, dictated by an Indian, with interlinear French translation. Paris, 1644. Cramoisy.

The eighteenth century opens with the Baron La Hontan. Seven *fac similes*, title-pages of vols. 1, 2, and 3, and four other title-pages differing in appearance, of the same work; the first of the series will be sufficient to indicate the scope of the books of this adventurer:

Nouveau Voyages
de
Mr. Le Baron de La Hontan
Dans
L'Amerique Septentrionale,
qui contiennent une rêlation des différens Peuples qui y habitent; la nature de leur Gouvernement; leur Commerce; leurs Coutumes, leur Religion, et leur maniére de faire la Guerre.

L'intêrêt des François & des Anglois dans le Commerce qu'ils font avec ces Nations; l'avantage que l'Angleterre peut retirer dans ce pays, etant en guerre avec la France. (*Sic.*)

Le tout enrichi de cartes et de figures.

Tome Premier.

Honoratus qui virtutem honorat.

A La Haye.

Chez Fréres l'Honoré, marchands Libraires.

MDCCIII.

The linguistics in Baron La Hontan's works are insignificant, and comprise, *Petit dictionaire des sauvages*, French and Algonkin, about twenty pages; conjugation of the verb "*to love*" in Algonkin, sakia, two pages; Algonkin numerals, and Huron words.

La Hontan's books obtained a large circulation. The first edition, in French, was printed at the Hague, in 1703; other editions followed, in 1704, 1705, 1706, 1707, 1708, 1709, and 1731, all in French. English editions were printed, in London, 1703 and 1735. German editions, at Hamburg, 1709; at Leipzig, in 1711 and 1721. Dutch editions, at Amsterdam, in 1721, 1728, 1739, and 1741.

Why so much space was given by Mr. Pilling to this recreant French adventurer's books, comprising, as stated, seven *fac similes*, and as many pages of double columns descriptive of the respective editions does not appear, although it is generally admitted that he cannot be quoted with confidence. La Hontan ranked with Tilly, de Beauvais, Durantay, La Forét, Du l'Hut, and the elder de Tonty, all daring adventurers of this epoch in the Northwest; another contemporary, and Gascon like himself, M. de la Mothe Cadillac, who successfully conducted the hazardous and romantic expedition from Trois Riviéres to the shore of the *d'etroit du Lac Erie*, where he built Fort Pontchartrain, was of the same school of adventurers and gallant soldiers. But, in the light of contemporaneous history, La Hontan might be designated "The Gascon Knight of the Pen." His name appears in frontier colonial history at Forts Frontenac, Niagara, Saint Joseph, Michilimacinac, Sault Ste. Marie, and Green Bay. He was trusted by Frontenac, and promoted from the ranks. He was born near Mont de Marson, Gascony, in 1667, and served while a mere youth in Canada, in 1683. Why he subsequently became an exile from his native country is not clear; he died at Hanover, in 1715.

It is a relief to turn from La Hontan to Charlevoix, whose descriptive letters follow, in chronological order, among the printed works of the eighteenth century, and are noticed as follows:

"Charlevoix, Pierre Francois Xavier de. Histoire et description generale de la Nouvelle France, avec le journal historique d'un Voyage, fait par ordre du Roi, dans l'Amérique Septentrionale. Par le P. de Charlevoix, de la Compagnie de Jésus.

"A Paris, chez Nyon Fils, Libraire, Quai des Augustins, a l'occasion. 1745. Avec approbation et privilege du Roi."

3 vols., 4°, maps.

The linguistics in the first edition are to be found in the 11th letter, and relate principally to the Algonquian languages and their distribution in Canada. Another edition of the same date, title and contents is described. A third edition is in 6 volumes,

12°. The title page to the 5th and 6th volumes is given as follows:

"Journal d'un voyage fait par ordre du Roi dans l'Amerique septentrionale; addressée à Madame la Duchesse de Lesdiguieres. Par le P. de Charlevoix de la Compagnie de Jésus. Chez Didot Libraire Quai des Augustins a la Bible d'or, etc."

The linguistics differing from those of the first edition are to be found in volume 5. Other Paris editions of the same year are noticed: Chez Rollin Fils Libraire, Quai des Augustins à St. Athanaise, et au Palmier. Also, chez Pierre François Giffart, Rue St. Jacques à Ste. Therese.

English editions of similar tenor are noted, printed for R. & J. Dodsley in Pall-Mall, London, and for R. Goadby; sold by R. Baldwin in Pater-Noster Row, London, 1763. A Dublin edition, by John Exshaw and James Potts, in Dame Street, 1766, is also noticed. In the biographical sketch of Charlevoix, taken from Appleton's "Cyclop. of Am. Biog.," mention is made of one of Dr. Shea's greatest works, his translation of "Charlevoix," in 6 volumes, New York (1865–1872). A work of great value to the historical reader on account of the abundant notes which literally illustrate the text. In the meantime occurred the conquest of Canada. La Nouvelle France, that great empire in the New World, was lost by the extravagance and corruption prevailing at the time in the French court; while the brave soldiers of France, without support and without supplies, yielded up their lives and the supremacy of France on the Plains of Abraham.

This event was a sad blow to the Algonquian confederacy; at the same time missionary zeal for the conversion of the North American Indian was no longer supplied from France.

Jean Baptiste de La Brosse, missionary of the Society of Jesus among the Montagnais Indians in Canada, composed and had printed in Quebec a manual of prayers entirely in the language of this nation, which Mr. Pilling notices as follows:

"Nehiro-iriniui aiamike massinahigan. Shatshegustsh, Mittinekapitsh, Iskuamiskutsh, Netshekatsh, Misht, Assinitsh, Shekutimitsh, Eknanatsh, Asuabmushuanitsh, Piakuagamitsh.

"Gaie missi, nehiro iriniui Astshitsh ka tatjits, kakueiasku aiamikatjits ka utshi.—Ornaments."

Uabistiguiatsh (Quebec) Massinahitsetuau, Broun gaie Girmor. 1767. Pp. 96. Small quarto. With approbation of Bishop Briant. The Indian name of Father Labrosse is given as *Tshitshisahigan, i.e., the broom.*

Mr. Pilling quotes from Dr. James Hammond Trumbull as fol-

lows. "The title-page shows that this manual was prepared for the use of the Montagnais Indians of the missions on the Saguenay and about Lake St John, etc., and all Nehiro Iriniui places wheresoever, who rightly pray, *i.e.*, are Christians."

A *fac simile* of the title-page of this prayer-book is given with the Montagnais description of its contents as literally given above. Copies were seen in the archives of the Archbishopric of Quebec and in the libraries of the British Museum, Congress, Gagnon, Harvard, Laval, Lenox, and Trumbull.

Mr. Pilling notices identical reprints at Quebec in 1817 and 1844.

The same year, 1767, Father Labrosse published a primer in Montagnais, a *fac simile* of the first page of which is given. This is an unique little work of 8 folio pages, 7 by 9 inches. The *fac simile* is reduced.

"In an account-book of Messrs Brown & Gilmore," continues Mr. Pilling, "who printed the work, now belonging to Surgeon-Major Neilson, of Quebec, appears the following entry: 'July 8, 1767. Received on account of general printing and of Père La Brosse for 3000 Indian alphabets, making one sheet quarto (size of the primer), £10.4.0.'" Copy of this work was seen in the archives of Laval University, Quebec. "I have received," continues Mr. Pilling, "through the kindness of Surgeon-Major Neilson, Quebec, Canada, the owner of the account-books of Messrs. Brown & Gilmore, among the first of the Canadian printers, the following extracts from their records concerning various publications of Father La Brosse."

"October 25, 1766. To 1000 Indian Kalendars for Père La Brosse, £4.10.0."

"July 8, 1767. To 200 catalogues of the Indians at Tadousack, etc., £1.16.0."

"Oct. 15, 1767. Received on account of general printing for 2000 Indian prayer-books, containing 6 sheets in 8vo., in English character of type, in Algonkin language, at $25 per sheet, from La Brosse, Jesuite missionary, £45.0.0."

"Do. to make the Indian alphabets in quarto at the same price with the above 8vo., £1.1.0."

"May 7, 1768. To general printing, 100 Indian kalendars for Père La Brosse, £2.6.0."

"Sept. 24, 1768. To general printing for a balance remaining on La Brosse's Indian kalendars per Madame Germain, £0.4.0."

"J. Bte La Brosse Jesuite, owes as follows, the dates as per margin from Mem^{d} Book.

"Nov. 10, 1770. 600 Indian alphabets in Abenaquis language making half a sheet 8vo. in English character of type, £3.0.0.

"July 29, 1773. Printed for J. B^{te} La Brosse Indian calendars

for 1773, 4, 5, 6, 7–8, for each year 127 copies, and delivered them to Louis Germain his agent a 25/6 per year, £7.13.0.

"April 11, 1774. Received of J. B^te^ La Brosse by the hands of Louis Germain for Indian calendars, £7.13.0.

"April 11, 1774. Received of J. B. La Brosse, by the hands of Louis Germain for Indian calendars, £7.13.0.

"June 5, 1778. Printed for the Rev. J. B^te^ La Brosse, Jesuit missionary, Indian almanacs for 7 years to come, 500 copies for each year, making on the whole 3500, for £18.4.0."

The aggregate paid by Father La Brosse for printing his Indian books and calendars exceeds £100 sterling. Comparing the value of money at the time with its present standard, the expenditure was comparatively large.

It may be observed that the names of but few of the Catholic missionaries who labored on the soil of North America during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, appear in the notices of the printed works in the Algonquian bibliography.

In this connection the linguistic results of the devotion of Father La Brosse to the intelligent improvement of the Montagnais, deserve the highest praise. These works were composed by him in the mission house at Tadoussac, probably during the long winter seasons which prevail in that region. What patience, what tedious and uninteresting study was required for each page, may be imagined.

The theatre of his missionary labors at the time was far removed from the French settlements and from Quebec. St. John's Lake lies about two hundred miles in a direct line inland from Quebec. Tadoussac could be reached by water between May and October by skillfully coasting down the St. Lawrence and up the Sagnenay in eight or ten days, allowing for camping at night and for the delays of foggy weather.

This region has become a favorite summer resort. Mr. Pilling quotes as follows from the journal of Father de La Brosse: "In the summer of 1766, Father Jean B^te^ de la Brosse, S.J., a native of Magnat, France (aged 42 years), arrived at Tadoussac, having been sent by Father de Glapion, Superior of the Jesuits of Quebec, to take charge of the Montagnais mission.

"Father Claude Godefroi Coquart, S.J., died on the 4th of July of the preceding year, at the mission of St. Francis Xavier.

"During 1767 for the benefit of those who can read and those who will learn to read, I had printed 3000 books of alphabets (primers) and 2000 books of prayers and catechism.

"The last touch was given to this work on the last day of October at the ninth moon. In the following year (1768) I wintered in the mission house.

"I taught many Savages to read, write, sing by note, and assist at ceremonies and rites, Mass and evening office.

"In the following year, toward the end of November, I moved to a point of land below the Jeremie Islands, called de Betsiamis, and there wintered among the Savages, teaching them to read, write, and sing by note. In the following year, 1770, having traversed the tribes of the King's domains (George iii of England) I moved to Quebec and wintered in the parish of St. Lawrence on the Isle of Orleans."

Father de La Brosse died at the early age of fifty-eight, at Tadoussac, where he was buried April 11, 1782, having spent sixteen years among the "Savages" in the Saguenay region, and almost completely isolated from civilized life. A notable fact connects with this history and the history of the brother missionaries of Father La Brosse who were engaged in evangelizing the Indian nations of Canada.

Little did Father La Brosse imagine while winning the Montagnais from paganism to Christianity in the isolated regions of the Saguenay, while teaching these "savages" to "read, write, and sing by note," and while providing for his neophytes thousands of devotional works which he had translated for them and had printed in their own language, that events were culminating in the capital of the Christian world destined in their results, to prove fatal to the existence of the Society of Jesus, of which he was a member. The influence of the Bourbon courts of Europe had placed the tiara on the head of Pope Clement XIV.—and the intrigues of the ministers of these courts was now concentrated in Rome to force this pontiff to crush with his signature, the most wonderful organization the world had ever seen. The reason and vitality of Clement had become weakened under the terrible pressure, and in a state of mind bordering on imbecility, he signed the brief, promulgated August 16, 1773, for the suppression of the Society of Jesus, and appointed a committee of cardinals, most of whom had been won to the side of the intriguers, to carry its conditions into effect.

Wherever this brief was promulgated through the episcopacy of the Church, the work of the Jesuit missionaries became paralyzed.[1]

[1] Alfani Rome, "Er a huit heures de soir touts les maisons des Jésuits sont investie par la garde corse et par les sbires. On notifié au Général de la Compagnie, Laurent Ricci, et aux Pères le bref de suppression. Alfani et Macedonio (de la commission) apposent les scelles sur les papiers ainsi que sur chaque maison de l'ordre. Laurent Ricci est transféré au College des Anglais; puis, sous les yeux des deux délégués pontificaux, le pillage des églises, des sacristies et des archives de la Societé s'organise.

"Il dura longtemps, et l'image de cette inertie en tiaire accordant l'impunité a touts les scandales qui en jaillirent ne s'est jamais effacé de la mémoire des Romains.

"On avait exproprié les Jésuites; on ne songea pas à assurer leur existence.

What was the effect of the brief of suppression upon the status and works of the Jesuit missionaries at the time in Canada, which was ruled by a British Governor-General in Quebec?

In defiance of the treaty made by Gen. Amherst at Montreal, which was subsequently ratified by France and England, in which the free exercise of the Catholic religion was guaranteed to the French race in Canada, the British government inhibited the Jesuits and other religious orders, after the conquest, from adding by immigration or by ordination, new members to their respective communities; the intention being to limit their existence to the living members. There were in 1773, in all Canada, but thirteen members of the Society of Jesus, whose names, ages and residences were as follows: The Father Superior was De Glapion, Augustin Louis, Quebec, aged 55; Cazot, Jean Joseph, Quebec, aged 46; De La Brosse, Tadoussac, aged 50; Du Jaunay, Pierre, Chaplain of the Ursulines at Quebec, aged 70; Floquet, Pierre René, at Montreal, aged 58; Giralt, S. T. de Villeneuve, with the Hurons at Loretto, aged 56; Gordan, Antoine, with the Iroquois at St. Regis, aged 49; Huguet, Joseph, Iroquois missionary at Sault St. Louis, Caughnawaga, aged 49; La Franc, Louis M., missionary with the Ottawas of the Upper Lakes, aged 58; Maquet, Alexis, at Quebec, aged 64; Meurin, Sebastian L., missionary at Kaskaskia, Illinois, aged 67; Potier, Pierre, Huron missionary at Detroit, aged 66; Will, Bernard, at Montreal, aged 50.

In this year, Jean Olivier Briand, occupied the episcopal chair of the saintly Laval. He had not been apprised of the publication at Rome of the fatal brief of Clement XIV., nor of the events which had succeeded in the Christian world immediately following its publication.

"Ricci et les Jésuites enfermés dans le chateau Saint-Ange ne se plaignirent pas de la captivite qu 'on leur infligiat.

"Ils dêclarerent qu 'ils etaient plus que jamais enfants de l'obeissance, et que comme membres de la société de Jésus, ou Prêtres Catholiques ils n'avaient rien à se reprocher des accusations dont on les chargeait."

Chrétineau-Joly, *Histoire, etc., de la Compagnie de Jésus.* Paris. 1846. Tome 5, pp. 306–8.

We will add from the foot-notes of Joly, that Alfani and Macedonio were prelates appointed by the commission of cardinals expressly to do their disgraceful work.

Both prelates were at the time in such positions as would lead them to the cardinalate.

Pius VI., to mark his displeasure, deprived Alfani of his functions at the Roman court.

Macedonio was the nephew of Clement XIV., and as such, according to custom, expected to receive the cardinal's hat from the successor of his late uncle. Pius VI. disregarded this custom, and with fitting contempt ignored the spoliation of the Jesuits' possessions in the Eternal City. Both prelates had so disgraced themselves as to be signally marked with the opprobrium they so richly deserved.

Nor did the official communication of the brief reach Bishop Briand at Quebec until 1774. Accompanying the certified copy of the brief were the instructions for its formulation prepared by the committee of cardinals above mentioned.

In these instructions the bishop was commanded under penalty of excommunication to forthwith assemble all the Jesuits within his episcopal jurisdiction at his palace, to read to them the brief of the Pope, and upon their submission, the act of which they were to sign, they were then required to relinquish the habit of their order and the name of Jesuits and to cease their functions as such thereafter.

This was the painful duty the Bishop of Quebec was commanded to perform, under the penalty stated; and unless the brief was promulgated in the manner directed, unless the missionary fathers were withdrawn from the respective fields of their labors, unless they came before the bishop at Quebec, signed their submission to the brief and then unfrocked themselves as Jesuits, the unfortunate brief would be inoperative, null and void, so far as Canada was concerned, and the bishop would have to suffer the penalty of his disobedience to the mandate of the See of Rome. It was a serious predicament for Bishop Briand. His obedience would so demoralize religion and education in Canada, that the consequences would be deplorable, for he had no priests to replace the Jesuits either on the St. Lawrence or in the far distant missions, while to dissolve the relations existing between the missionaries and the Indian peoples with whom they were domiciled, would not be tolerated by these nations nor submitted to without serious danger to the peace of Canada.

On the other hand his failure to comply with the papal instructions might cost him his mitre.

But before he could decide upon the course to be pursued, he was sent for by the Governor-General of Canada, and explicitly informed by this representative of British power, that being aware of the events in Rome, and also of the fact of the arrival of the brief, at Quebec, he as bishop and spiritual ruler of Canada, was forbidden to promulgate the brief he had received, or even to make known its reception, which he must keep a profound secret. For reasons of State His Majesty's Government in Canada would insist upon this course. The Governor-General added that it would be impolitic on his part to permit the religious status of the Canadian people to be demoralized and he would be called to strict account by his majesty if he sanctioned any measure calculated to disturb the present peaceful relations between the government and the Indian nations.

Did Bishop Briand obey the mandate of Rome, or the positive

commands of the representative of George III., whose rule was supreme?

Certain it is no Jesuit of the old régime was ever unfrocked in Canada under authority of the brief of Clement XIV. In that country, ruled by a heretic; in White Russia, ruled by the schismatic Catherine II.; in Prussia, ruled by Frederick II., a liberal scholar and an admirer of erudite men, the Jesuits retained their autonomy.

No notice was ever taken of Bishop Briand's letter of explanation sent to Rome. Clement XIV. became decidedly insane, but recovered his reason before his death in 1774. Pius VI. succeeded to the tiara February 15, 1775, and a change of policy ensued. But what of the thirteen venerable Fathers existing at the epoch of these events? One by one they ended their days in peace and were called to their eternal reward. The last survivor was the venerable Jean Joseph Cazot, who was permitted to witness the dawn of the nineteenth century. He expired on the 16th of March, 1800, last of the line of illustrious and saintly members of his order belonging to the old régime in Canada.

Upon his demise, the government took possession of the estates, property and papers of the Jesuits in Canada; and but a few years since, after a memorable struggle, the Fathers of the present régime in Canada recovered a tithe of the value of the vast estates which had been sequestered nearly a century ago.

A notice of the geographical works of La Harpe, Jean Francois de, 32 vols., 8° and atlas, Paris, 1780–1801, in the 14th volume of which are some linguistics, Abnaki, etc., closes the French group of printed works comprised in the notices of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The Dutch group for the same period is not extensive; limited, as it is, there is evidence of the high literary standard of the Dutch writers of the time in the works named. The most important is noticed as follows: "Donck Adriaen Van der. Beschryvinge Van Nieuvv-Nederlant. Ghelijck het tekenwoordigh in staet is Begrijpende de Nature, Aert, gelegentheyt en vrucht-berheyt van het selve Lant; mitsgaders de proffijtelijcke en de gewenste toevallen, die aldaer tot onderhout der Menschen soo uyt haer selven als van buyten ingebracht gevonden worden," etc. Amsterdam, 1655, with two fine, large *fac-similes*.

In this description of the New Netherlands given by Van der Donck, who was Director-General of the Dutch West India Company, the linguistics relate to the Indian nations, the Manhattan, Mingua Savanoos and Wapanoos. Three Dutch editions and one New York translation, 1841, are described.

An earlier work in the Dutch group is that of Joannes de Laet.

"Beschrijvinghe van West Indien door Joannes de Laet. Tweede druck," etc. Tot Leyden bij de Elzeviers. A°. 1630. The linguistic given by de Laet relate to the Souriquois language.

Nearly a century later appeared the first in the German group, noticed as follows:

Grube Rev. Bernard Adam. Dellawaerisches Gesang Büchlein. Bethlehem (Pa). J. Brandmüller, 1763. Text pp., 1–8, 16°., an excellent *fac simile* of the title page of this little hymn ook, which is entirely in the Delaware language, except the German title above and headings in the same language to the hymns. A second work by the same author, "Harmony of the Gospels," translated into the Delaware tongue, issued from the same press in the same year, is noticed.

Rev. Mr. Grube was a Moravian missionary, a native of Erfurth, Germany, who came as a missionary to Pennsylvania in 1746 with a Moravian colony. He died at Bethlehem in 1808 in his ninety-second year.

The work of another Moravian missionary is noticed as follows:

"Zeisberger, Rev. David. Essay of a Delaware-Indian and English spelling-book, for the use of the schools of the Christian Indians on Muskingum River. By David Zeisberger, Missionary among the Western Indians. Philadelphia. Printed by Henry Miller, 1776, pp. 113, 16°."

This closes the series of works in the groups named of the two previous centuries. The English works during the same period will be considered in another article.

Richard R. Elliott.

HIGHER CRITICISM AND THE BIBLE.

TO the general public, "Higher Criticism" does not mean anything very definite. Yet the word has become, in quite recent times, so familiar that it is found, not only in the ponderous tome of the German scholar and in the theological lecture-hall, but is bandied about in the drawing-room, and is used in the popular literature for sale at the railroad book-stalls, in the monthly reviews, and in the daily newspapers, and has been adopted into the ordinary language of the specialist and the amateur alike. Though, perhaps, not well chosen, the term is now established, and, until a better one is found to replace it, it is sure to remain. But what does the word mean? It is the primary purpose of the present article neither to defend nor to refute "Higher Biblical Criticism," but simply to answer the above question, to state wherein higher biblical criticism consists, and to give an *exposè* of its nature, different kinds, aims, methods, principles, assumptions, and results.

Such an exposition will be the best recommendation of whatever is true in higher criticism, and the best refutation of its objectionable features. Yet, if occasion offers, some of the latter will be briefly refuted. As Higher Criticism is a part of "Biblical Introduction," it will be well to begin by explaining the latter.

"Biblical Introduction" is the science which has for its object to prepare the mind of the reader to understand Sacred Scripture properly. It is a summary of all the indispensable or useful information, it is a systematic collection of all the preliminary and subsidiary knowledge presupposed in the reader as a proximate preparation for the intelligent study of Scripture in whole or in part. Its limits are not precisely defined. It formerly meant all sorts of antiquarian odds and ends of information on Sacred Scripture, without unity and without definite limits. Even yet there is some difficulty in fixing its boundaries. It once included "Biblical Geography," "Biblical Archæology," "Biblical Philology," "Biblical Chronology," and "Biblical Hermeneutics," all of which, however, are now handled much more exhaustively in separate treatises. As now limited in extent, "Biblical Introduction" deals with all the *preliminary* questions generally discussed under the headings of authorship, time and place of composition, analysis of contents, scope of writer, occasion that called forth the book, class of readers for whom it was first composed. The aim and result of

all this is, that the authority of Scripture being once solidly established, the reader may correctly interpret it and quote it both to defend the truth and to refute error. In other words, the scope of "Biblical Introduction" is to give a clear and comprehensive view of the character of the Bible, and of the actual situation or environment out of which it grew, and from which alone it can be scientifically understood and interpreted. It supplies the preparatory information which should precede the scientific study of the text.

Introduction is critical in character. "Criticism" is a method of investigation for the purpose of ascertaining the truth. In every department of science it has its place. It inquires into the character and reliability of all sources of information. It investigates the value of traditional opinions. It is a sifting or winnowing process, instituted for the purpose of separating the wheat from the chaff, truth from error, fact from fiction. It is necessary for all true progress, not only in Biblical studies, but in all other branches of knowledge. This is ideal criticism; the actual is frequently quite another thing. Is there any reason why the general principles of criticism employed in all other branches of knowledge should not be applied to Sacred Scripture? Does the fact that Scripture is sacred exempt it from the same critical investigations to which all literature and all history have been subjected? Why should we fear, in the case of Scripture, the most rigorous analysis? If Scripture is the Word of God, it will come out of the fiery ordeal unscathed. To hold the contrary would betray a want of faith in God's Word. If introduction were not critical, it would not be a science. To separate the genuine from the spurious, the pure from the corrupt, would be impossible without some fixed principles, without some solid criteria to guide the scholar in his investigation of facts. Such criteria we are supposed to possess in the science of Introduction. Hence the name "Critical" Introduction.

But Introduction investigates such questions as the authorship, date and place of composition of books. Now, these are facts which belong to the domain of history. Hence the name critico-"historical" Introduction. But Scripture is literature. Hence, again, the name critico-historical "Literary" Introduction. But Introduction is not, as some modern writers would have it, a mere part of the general literature of the world; for, if it were so, it would form no part of a course of theology. It is "sacred" literature. It is a species by itself, and must have a special treatment. In studying any literary work, it is necessary to consider all the motives that prompted the writer and all the influences brought to bear upon him, and resulting in the produc-

tion of the book such precisely as it is But in the composition of every book of Sacred Scripture, the writer was moved by that peculiar supernatural influence called inspiration, which gave to the book its distinctive character, and which made Scripture what it is—Sacred.

Any attempt, therefore, at an Introduction which should omit, or purposely ignore, as all rationalists do, the inspiration of the books, would be an incomplete treatment of the subject. It would separate what God has joined together, the Divine and human elements in Holy Writ.

Because its investigations are conducted on two distinct lines, Biblical Criticism, in the now usual sense of the word, is divided into two kinds; one of which is called "Lower," the other is called "Higher Criticism." They are both branches of the same study, differing in degree, but not in kind. Yet they do differ; for it may very easily happen that a book, taken as a whole, may be the genuine product of the man whose name it bears, and yet may contain some spurious passages, or be slightly mutilated in some of its details. We may contend that St. John wrote the first Epistle ascribed to him, and yet deny that he wrote the famous "Comma Joanneum," or the "testimony of the three heavenly witnesses."

"Lower Criticism" is taken to mean that department of general Biblical Criticism which busies itself with *minute* inquiries into the correct reading, and concerns itself with the punctuation, letters, syllables, prefixes, suffixes, words, phrases, sentences, and even paragraphs of the Sacred Text. It aims at the restoration of the Text to its original state. It furnishes the translator, the commentator, and the Higher Critic with a solid basis to work upon. It is limited to those principles and processes, which enable the critic to detect and correct alterations in the text, to decide upon the genuineness of disputed various readings, to obtain, as far as possible, the original words of Scripture, and, by a process of elimination, to reproduce an edition conformable to the original as it left the hand of the Sacred Penman. From the actual condition of the text, it aims to deduce its original condition. For this, microscopic accuracy and patient attention to the minutest details are needed. The materials on which "Lower Criticism" works are the manuscripts of the Bible in the Greek and Hebrew originals, ancient translations into various languages, and the writings of early ecclesiastical writers, chiefly the Fathers, who have quoted Scripture so largely as to be serviceable as witnesses to the condition of the text, from which they quote. But for the loss of the original Greek and Hebrew autographs, "Textual Criticism" would never have been found necessary. As it is,

however, accidental and unintentional errors could not have been avoided without a perpetual miracle, or, rather, without a series of miracles as continuous as time, and as extensive as Christendom.

"Higher Biblical Criticism" is so called to distinguish it from the "Lower," on which it is based. "Higher Biblical Criticism" does not necessarily mean an attempt to discredit the Bible; it does not necessarily mean an attempt to repudiate its authority; it does not mean the rejection of inspiration; nor does it imply a denial of the truths of supernatural religion. It is a science the object of which is to investigate the authority of *entire* books of Holy Scripture. The "Higher Critic" takes these documents as they leave the hand of the "Lower Critic," and examines them as literature and as history. His object is to place the reader of Scripture, as far as is possible, side by side with the inspired writer, to show the circumstances of time, place, and person, under which the books were composed, and to make him realize how the contents of the book correspond with such circumstances. In other words, the object of the "Higher Critic" is to enable the reader to understand Scripture rightly. To do this, it helps very much to know who wrote the book, when, where, on what occasion, for what purpose, and from what sources, or pre-existing materials, and for what class of persons the book was composed. This is the principal group of questions which the "Higher Critic" proposes to answer. He discusses them, too, by the same methods that are used in discussing similar questions in the case of classical Greek and Latin literature. Hence, "Higher Criticism" is not a modern science. In germ it is older than Christianity, and has nothing new about it but the name and the development. Yet there prevails an impression, fostered by the critics themselves, that this science is a decidedly modern invention. This is a mistake. The general principles on which it is based were known and cultivated some centuries before the birth of Christ, chiefly at Alexandria, where a school of critics thoroughly discussed the Iliad, and the Odyssey of Homer, and other ancient classical works. Dionysius of Halycarnassus in the first century before Christ was remarkable for his critical acumen. "Higher Criticism," therefore, is not an invention of biblical, but of classical scholars, who used it while studying the classical productions of ancient Greece and Rome. Yet when Christian scholars undertook to study Sacred Scripture critically according to the methods of general literary and historical criticism, they too, adopted the same term with the additional qualifying adjective "Biblical." Hence the phrase "Higher Biblical Criticism." In the early Christian Church such scholars as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome defended

against Porphyry, Celsus and others, the books of Scripture by the same general principles as we do to-day.

By Higher Biblical Criticism is, therefore, meant a critical inquiry into the *Divine* authority of Sacred Scripture, which depends on its inspiration; into its *ecclesiastical* authority, which depends on its Canonicity; and into its *human* authority, which results from the Genuinity, Integrity and Credibility of the sacred books. It is the business of the higher critic to analyze the documents with which he has to deal, to determine their value, relative age and general credibility. If such is the meaning of the word, surely no valid objection can be made against this science itself, but only against the *manner* in which it is sometimes cultivated. For, thus understood, the exercise of criticism is not only allowable, but even desirable. The best way to know what a thing is, is to learn how it came about, how it came into existence. There is no reason why a Christian should be afraid of the most searching inquiry into the human authorship, date of composition and meaning of the several books of Sacred Scripture, provided, of course, that the critic is not misled by false principles in his researches. Though the above is the only legitimate meaning of Higher Criticism, yet it must be confessed that the word is often used as if it meant a transcendental kind of criticism cultivated only by men of altogether exceptionally superior intellectual abilities. No doubt some of the critics are self-complacent enough not to suppress thoughts of this kind; for the arrogant tone adopted by some of them would seem to show that they fancy themselves placed on pedestals to proclaim to the world a new Gospel. On the contrary, the humble duty even of the "Higher Critic" is to ascertain, collect, and classify facts, and then draw such conclusions only as the facts justify, and not to be too certain of the results.

The object of Higher Criticism is attained partly by *external*, partly by *internal* arguments. The former are drawn from sources extrinsic to the book under discussion. The latter are found in what the book says about its own origin, and in the allusions which it makes, either implicitly or explicity, to its own author. Yet here it is necessary to decide whether such statements were made by the author himself, or subsequently interpolated by an editor or redactor. Also whether the book was not written in the spirit of the supposed author, yet without intention to deceive. Thus, the Book of Wisdom "is written in the person of Solomon, and contains his sentiments. It is uncertain who was its author." Or the book may convey, by inference, some hint which could serve as a clue to discover its author in allusions more or less remote to facts otherwise known, or to habits and customs known to have belonged only to a limited period of time, or in

local and personal allusions, or in historical or archæological or religious data, or in such other indications as might point more or less unequivocally to the age, the place, the author. The presumption is that every forgery will bear the ear-marks of forgery, and that in a book, especially of any size, something is pretty sure to leak out to betray the author or to locate the origin of the book both in time and space. Thus, the remark made in Joshua 16, 10: That the "Canaanites dwelt in Gazer unto this day," seems to imply that this book was written before the destruction of Gezar by Pharao, which took place in the time of Solomon. Also the casual remark in Judges that the Jebusites dwelt in Jerusalem among the Benjamites "unto this day," is understood to mean that the book was composed before David captured the citadel on Mount Sion, II. Kings 5, 6–9. An old custom that prevailed in the days of Ruth is expressly called an antiquated custom, making it clear that the book containing this narrative was written so long after the events therein recorded, that the custom had time to become obsolete. "Now this was a custom in former times in Israel," Ruth 4, 7.

There is no reason why this principle should not hold in sacred as well as in profane literature. For, in the composition of every book of Scripture, human co-operation went hand in hand with divine operation. The primary cause of the book is God. The instrumental cause is man. The book came *from* God as its first source; but it came *through* men as its channel. There are, therefore, in Scripture many accidental properties of a purely human origin, and peculiar to each writer. This human factor in a sacred book consists of the words, the style, the arrangement, and distribution of the materials; all of which are the mere vehicles for the communication of the divine thought, the envelope in which the message is conveyed to those to whom it is addressed. There can be no doubt that the sacred penman retains his personal, local, and national habits, customs, and manners, his literary style, his logical methods, his previous grade of education. Hence, his choice of a language in which to write, the selection of the individual words, and the combination of them into sentences and paragraphs, as well as the order and sequence of ideas, depend in great measure on the free will of the writer. Hence, each writer has reproduced himself in his book, and, if we were familiar enough with him and his entire environment, we could see him as unmistakably in his writings as we could in a photograph. In fact, that the books of Scripture reflect the peculiarities of their several writers, as unmistakably as if they wrote not under the influence of inspiration, is obvious even to the casual reader. Each book reflects the habits, character, and trend of thought, the tone, color,

sentiment, the modulation of mood and passion, even the very atmosphere in which the writer lived and moved. Therefore, much of what is in the book is the product of the place, the man, the age in which he lived, the people, and the civilization under which it was composed. To most people it is impossible to believe that any one can so divest himself of himself and of his own individuality, clothe himself in the personality of another, and, projecting himself into a distant age, write as though he belonged to that age. Much of this holds true in sacred as well as in profane literature. Hence it is, that, in the *absence* of sufficient external evidence, the peculiarities just described are taken as proof more or less conclusive, that a given book was written at such a time, among such a people, under such a form of government, under the influence of such a degree of culture, civil and religious, by such a person, for such a purpose. All such intimations of date, and place of composition, etc., are called the "Internal Criteria." It is a matter of prime importance, to decide whether internal or external proofs are preferable. Advanced critics reject most external testimony, and depend almost exclusively on internal evidence, which is subjective and mostly fanciful and capricious. Ultra conservative critics rely almost entirely on external evidence. Both may be wrong. Each kind of proof is good in its place; for it sometimes happens, that the only proof for the human authorship of a book is external, as in the case of Jude. It also sometimes happens that the only evidence that can be alleged to determine the date of composition of a book is internal, as in the case of Ruth. However, we must make a broad distinction between the value of internal proofs *for* and *against* the authorship or date of composition of any work. A book written originally in English, in whose warp and woof there is constant mention of telephones, phonographs, Gatling guns, Grover Cleveland, the Wilson Silver Bill, we may safely conclude was written neither in the time of Moses nor of St. Paul, but was composed in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. But to tell who, of all the millions speaking English in Great Britain and America wrote the book, internal arguments are of little avail. There may be, for all we know, ten thousand men capable of writing it. Hence, the Holy Father, in his "Encyclical on the Study of Sacred Scripture," very properly reproves the excessive and almost exclusive use by critics of this kind of arguments. For there can be no doubt that, comparing *kind* with *kind*, the external are preferable. That a given book is the work of such a writer is a question of fact. As such, it belongs to the province of history, and is to be proved by competent witnesses, if such can be found. "Facta probanda per testes." St. Augustine reproaches the Manichaeans

of his time with inconsistency. "When," he says, "I affirm that St. Matthew wrote the account of the Virgin birth of the Saviour in the first chapters of his Gospel, you immediately answer that that portion of his Gospel was not written by Matthew, although the Universal Church teaches that it was written by him. You then quote the book of Manes, in which the Virgin birth is denied. Now, as you are certain, and for stronger reasons than you are certain, that Manes wrote his gospel, so am I certain that Matthew wrote his Gospel, namely, the testimony of all who are competent to speak, and who form an unbroken succession from the time of Matthew to our own day."—*Contra Faustum*, lib. 28, c. 2.

The human authority of a book of Scripture is established if we can demonstrate its *genuinity*, *integrity* and *veracity*. These qualities the "higher critic" endeavors to prove principally from a *literary* and *historical* standpoint.

As to *genuinity*, the critic inquires whether the writing in question is the product of the man whose name it bears. If not, was the work falsely ascribed to some great name for the purpose of giving it a more ready credence and a wider circulation than it would otherwise have had, and with the intention to deceive? or, though pseudonymous, was it written in good faith, in the *spirit* as well as in the *name* of its reputed author? If no date or name is given, can it be shown that the work is contemporary with the facts therein related? Many books of the Old Testament are anonymous, and neither Jewish nor Christian tradition can tell when or by whom they were written. Humanly speaking, the degree of authority which we recognize in a writing will depend largely on the length of time that has elapsed between the occurrence of the events and the date of composition of a narrative. This is true, especially if the work relates prodigies or promulgates laws for the first time, since not every author is competent to impose laws on a people. Statements made by an eye-witness are naturally more reliable than statements made by hearsay; and the testimony of a contemporary witness, all things being equal, is preferable to that of a writer who is later by several centuries. Yet, if we are assured that God is the author of a book, the date of composition is to Christians, unless from a scientific point of view, a matter of comparatively little consequence.

Integrity is an application or extension of genuinity to each part of a book. It is akin to textual criticism, only it concerns larger portions of the work. It is generally defined immunity from corruption. Under this head the higher critic searches, though often in vain, for sufficient data to enable him to pronounce whether the book is the product of one mind, or a collection of fragments by many authors, subsequently blended and

fused into one by a later editor. If so, whence were the original materials obtained? How many independent documents were incorporated into the work? Of what date were they respectively? To what extent did the final redactor make omissions, additions and alterations in each while dovetailing them into one? In the case of works written so many centuries ago, as the books of Holy Scripture, it is too much to expect that all such questions should ever be apodictically answered. For, from the nature of the case, the results of such inquiries may have all the shades of difference that separate impossibility from possibility, and this from probability, and this again from actual certainty.

As to *veracity*, a writer is a witness; therefore, to be reliable, he should have the requisite qualities of every good witness, namely, a knowledge of the truth, and a sincere desire to impart it to others. The knowledge required in a witness is not necessarily erudition, nor learning, nor scientific acquirements, but simply an acquaintance with the facts related, if the book is historical; or with the doctrinal principles enunciated, if the book is didactic in character. A very ignorant man may be a very good witness, provided he have his eyes and ears open to what goes on around him. On the other hand, the most learned man may be a very useless witness, if so lost in contemplation and abstract metaphysical speculation as to be unconscious of lesser, though, nearer realities.

These subjects are studied according to the "literary method" whenever the Higher Critic inquires whether a book is prose or poetry; and if prose, whether it is legal, historical or didactic; and if poetry, whether it is epic, lyric, pastoral or dramatic. In the first and second chapters of St. Luke's Gospel are found three canticles, the "Magnificat," composed by the Blessed Virgin Mary; the "Benedictus," composed by Zachary; and the "Nunc dimittis," by the aged Simeon; all poetry. The entire 49th chapter of Genesis, containing Jacob's prophecy about Shiloh; the 23d and 24th chapters of Numbers, containing Balaam's prophecy about the star to rise out of Jacob; the 15th chapter of Exodus, or the Song sung by Moses, his sister Miriam, and the children of Israel after the passage of the Red Sea; the entire 32d chapter of Deuteronomy, containing the canticle of Moses; and the whole of the 33d chapter containing his last blessing; the 2d chapter of II. Samuel, from 18th to 28th verse, giving David's lamentation over Saul and Jonathan: "And he bade them teach the children of Israel the song of the bow; behold, it is written in the book of Jasher. 'How are the mighty fallen; tell it not in Gath'"; the 22d and 23d chapters of II. Samuel; the whole book of Psalms; thirty-nine out of the forty-two chapters of Job; and the entire Canticle of Canticles, are all Hebrew poetry. In fact, many ancient poems

of all sorts, numerous enough to make a collection almost equal to the Psalter with its one hundred and fifty psalms, have been incorporated into the Pentateuch alone and the book of Josue. Many critics, depending entirely on the analysis of Genesis from a purely literary standpoint, claim to have discovered in it several independent narratives differing in style, method and scope, and all covering more or less the same period of history.

They suppose that considerable portions of the ancient literature of all nations are of a composite character, consisting of older narratives incorporated with only such modifications as to allow the parts to be juxtaposed and fitted together into a more or less continuous narrative. Some of the most conservative Catholic Scripturists admit that some books may embody documents older by centuries than the books in the form in which we now possess them. What harm if Genesis contains documents written originally by Abraham? What harm if the early chapters of Esdras were written by Shashbasar or Zorobabel seventy-five years before the time of Esdras? And if the fourth book of Kings, though written during the Babylonian captivity, and composed of original documents once preserved in the public archives, contains whole chapters literally copied from the same reliable sources, so much the more credible is the book from a purely human point of view. In this literary work the critics themselves admit that they have too much relied upon the unreliable, for they have depended too much on mere theory and speculation, and apply their critical analysis to materials so volatile and impalpable as to escape the analytical process.

We frequently hear them say that two books, or two parts of the same book, if sufficiently different in style, must have been written by two authors, apparently forgetting that the same man may vary his style to suit the varying character of the topics treated, and that, with advancing age and wider experience and broader culture, style may undergo changes to suit the changed subjective condition of the writer. George Washington's messages to Congress were quite different from his Farewell Address, and his business note is quite unlike the letter which a merchant would write home to his wife. It is the height of presumption to pretend to be so well acquainted, for instance, with Isaias, an oriental living two thousand five hundred years ago, and under the influence of another religion and of another civilization, as to know beforehand the style of language he would use on a given occasion. It is an overweening criticism that pretends to know *a priori* just what a writer should say, and how he would say it, and, on discovering that he acted otherwise, declares the writing spurious. The critics do not know themselves what they would have said two thousand

five hundred years ago, were they then living. It is so different from his usual style that no one could have believed, till the strange fact had been demonstrated beyond a possibility of doubt, that the poet Petrarch was the author of the work, "*De Republica bene Administranda*"; nor, till it was proved, would any one believe that the fanciful poet Boccaccio had written the very dry and very prosy treatise, "*De montibus, sylvis, fontibus, lacubus, fluminibus, stagnis, seu paludibus, et de nominibus maris liber.*"

The uncertainty that characterizes the conclusions of literary analysis is now tacitly admitted by many critics, who consequently seek to support their philological conclusions by the *historical* method. This method is used whenever the investigations are based, not so much on data contained in the book itself, as on works of contemporary or subsequent writers. The critic asks, what do the other books of the Bible, what do the monuments and other literary remains of surrounding nations say about the book, or the contents of the book, under discussion? Answer to these inquiries is made possible by the fact that the peculiar geographical position of Palestine, the principal stage on which the events of Bible history were enacted, brings it into close contact with such ancient peoples as the Egyptians, Phœnicians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Greeks, and Romans, and by the fact that the Hebrews had much in common with many of these nations in habits, customs, religious and political ideas, language, etc. Hence, we have the right to expect that much of what is recorded in Scripture should be related also in the literary remains of these nations. Such is the fact. For the result of comparing the sacred with the profane records is, in many instances, a remarkable confirmation of the Biblical narrative.

Many statements of Scripture, though once unsupported by other testimony, have received unexpected confirmation from the contemporary monuments of surrounding nations. Thus the very interesting "Moabite Stone," which was erected by King Mesha at Dibon, in the land of Moab, about B.C. 900 or 896, at a distance of twelve miles east of the Dead Sea, and discovered in 1868, bears thirty-four lines of a closely written Hebrew inscription, which throws a flood of light on several portions of the third and fourth Books of Kings. Also the famous "Black Obelisk" contains in its Assyrian cuneiform inscription a remarkable corroboration of the Biblical account of Jehu, King of Israel. Again, the passage, Isaias xx., 1, in which "Sargon, King of Assyria," is mentioned only casually and for the first and last time, not only in the whole Bible but in all known literature, was the sole evidence for two thousand five hundred years of there ever having been such a person as "Sargon, King of Assyria." But the discov-

eries recently made in the cuneiform inscriptions found at Nineveh give us a complete history of the man and of the dynasty which he founded.

A very limited familiarity with "Higher Criticism" is enough to show that the critics are not all of the same way of thinking. Their literary equipment, their scientific acquirements, their intellectual calibre, and their philosophical prejudices, are as various as can well be imagined. Nor is it easy to find comprehensive terms by which to designate, with any degree of accuracy, all the varying shades of opinion that prevail among the critics of even one school. In general they may be divided into *two classes:* the first called positive, moderate, conservative: the second, negative, advanced, radical, destructive. Yet these two classes so shade and blend into each other that it is not possible to classify all the individuals under the one or under the other category. Nor are these terms always unequivocal. "Destructive Criticism" is usually employed, in a sense offensive to most Christians, to designate a criticism so conducted as to tend to undermine the long-established belief in the authority of Sacred Scripture; whereas "Conservative Criticism" is that which tends to preserve in *statu quo* the traditional belief in Scripture, or the opinions prevalent at any one time. Still, neither is essentially good nor essentially bad. All depends on what is destroyed, and on what is preserved. "Destructive Criticism" did good work when it discredited the once prevalent belief in the *verbal* inspiration of Scripture, according to which every word, every syllable, every letter, every punctuation mark, and every vowel point was said to have been revealed to the sacred penman while in a trance or ecstacy, during which he committed all to writing as mechanically as a type-writer.

The idea is quite prevalent that all higher criticism is necessarily "Destructive." Nothing could be more false and misleading. There is a criticism of doubt, which destroys; and there is a criticism of faith, which preserves; or, if it destroys the false, it is in order to build up the true instead. One may avail himself of Higher Criticism to defend as well as to attack, the authority of Sacred Scripture. Higher criticism is simply the application of scientific methods to the study of ancient documents, and can be used for defence or attack. There may also be a lack of candor and honesty in either case. Mere mental inertia and an unwillingness to unlearn what has once been learned may induce some to adhere to inherited notions which may be none the more true for being inherited. On the other hand, an itching for what is startling and paradoxical has led many a one to run after novelty. Yet we must admit that, though first cultivated by Catholics, Biblical Criticism, especially in its most objectionable features, is now intimately bound up with Rationalism.

The attitude of "Higher Critics" toward Christianity is so various that it cannot be described with any degree of brevity and, at the same time, with accuracy. Some "Higher Critics" are antagonistic to the Christian religion, which they believe to be false. Some consider it only as the best religion discovered up to date; but contend that, by virtue of the law of progressive evolution and by the continuous development of human reason, Christianity will yet be so transformed as ultimately to be fit for its mission of elevating the human race to a higher spiritual level than ever before attained. But many "Higher Critics" are sincere Christians and look upon Biblical criticism merely as a literary and historical science, and as applicable to the Bible as it is to the other literary remains of antiquity. They are firmly convinced that their faith will remain absolutely unshaken by the results of critical investigations; or, rather, they feel that their faith will be strengthened by it. The divine authority of Scripture does not depend upon its human, but on its divine, authorship. Believing, as these Christian critics do, that all truth is harmonious, they cannot be convinced that criticism, if sober and worthy of the name, can ever result in antagonism to the Christian faith. Between this class of critics, who are Catholic or orthodox Protestant, and radical critics, there is a difference, not merely of degree, but of kind; a difference, not only in the results attained, but in the principles which form the basis of investigation. For the former admit, and the latter reject, the presence of the supernatural element in Scripture, namely, revealed religion and its chief criteria, miracles and prophecies.

But what, you may ask, do Higher Critics hope to accomplish? By what *motives* are they actuated? Here again there is a vast difference between the two classes of critics in their *aims*.

It is well known that some critics are influenced by purely *secular*, others by purely *religious*, motives; while most are led by a mixture of both kinds of motives. The first have a purely scholarly interest, and study Scripture for *literary* or for *historical* purposes. They ask who wrote the Bible, just as we ask who wrote the plays commonly ascribed to Shakespeare, or who wrote the Koran, the Zend Avesta, or the Rig Veda? To them the Bible is merely one of the most interesting remains of the literature of antiquity that has come down to us. To them the Bible has only an historical interest, and they study it as they would any other ancient work, for the sake of the historical or antiquarian information that it gives of a most interesting people, the Hebrews. Its religious character begets no presumption in its favor, nor, perhaps, does it produce against it any unfavorable prejudice. Yet it must be acknowledged that with a rapidly increasing class of negative critics there is a poorly disguised intention to weaken and

even to destroy the authority of the Bible as a channel of revealed religion.

The other class of critics approach, and continue, the study of the Sacred Books full of intense Christian faith. To them the Bible may be the most enchanting literature ever produced; but, above all, it is a book of religion. It occupies a unique position. It is the Book of Books; it is *the* Book. It is not merely the word of man, but it is also and principally the Word of God. They may apply to it nearly all the fundamental principles of higher Biblical criticism, but they do so in order the better to understand the Book, and to render it more serviceable for practical, devotional or theological purposes. The literary and historical features of the Book, though interesting, are only the shell that conceals the kernel of Divine Revelation.

As to the *assumptions* of advanced critics, they are such as to promote the aims just described. The first assumption is that Scripture is to be treated just as profane literature. This is true, but only to a certain extent; for Scripture, though literature, is sacred literature. A Book whose author is God should not be handled after the same fashion, nor by the same standards, as purely human literature.

Nor is the historian free, as negative critics contend, to treat Scripture as he would any other source of historical information. Once admit that God is its author, and it will be self-evident that the mere fact that Isaias mentioned Cyrus by name some centuries before his birth, does not prove that the book was written after the time of Cyrus. Nor is the assumption any more tenable that an ancient Oriental, never trained in the strict scientific methods that prevail in a European University, nor ever drilled in the prosy, dry-as-chaff logic of Aristotle, should be judged by the same standard as a modern Occidental. But while more scope should be given to the play of imagination in the poetic Oriental, it is certain, in point of fact, that more accuracy has been demanded of him, than of the technical modern European. One solitary mistake of detail, one hyperbole, one imaginary anachronism, has been deemed sufficient reason for denying all authority to an entire book, even when it was manifest that the objectionable statement was of the critic's own creation, or was due to the ignorance of the reader, or to the negligence and sleepiness of some subsequent scribe. And all this, because destructive critics have acted on the very absurd assumption that, just to suit them, an ancient Semite was obliged to express his thoughts after the same fashion, with the same sobriety and precision, and in the same jejune style of exposition as a modern scientist.

It is a very common mode of proceeding for destructive critics

to support their theories by reasoning from the abstract *possibility* of an event, to the *existence* of the same. We have all grades of possibility suddenly changed into actuality. "It is not impossible"; "It is possible"; "It is quite possible"; "It is very possible that such might have been the case." Without further demonstration, and on the very next page, you are surprised to find that it *is* the case. Wellhausen informs us that it was "possible" for the Aaronic priesthood, during the exile, to have written much of the Pentateuch; from which he leaves us to infer that they did write it. But we do not ask whether they might, could, would, or should, have written it; but *did* they? It was Harduin's theory that the "Odes of Horace, the Æneid of Virgil, and the histories of Livy and Tacitus, as well as the entire collection of Latin classical literature, were the forgeries of Benedictine monks of the thirteenth century." Cardinal Newman, in his "Grammar of Assent," remarks on this: "No doubt the numerous religious bodies then existing over the face of Europe had leisure enough, in the course of a century, to compose not only all the classics, but all the Church Fathers as well. The question is whether they had the ability?" Even had they the ability, the further question would still remain, whether they exercised that ability, whether they *did* do what they *could* do?

A large part of the arguments by which the advanced critics endeavor to prove the late date and unhistorical character of the Scriptural Books may be described as "Argumenta e Silentio." They tacitly take it for granted that every writer living 2000 or 3000 years ago, under the influence of another civilization, and in a very differently constituted society, should have mentioned everything that we could now wish him to have mentioned; that in fact he should have mentioned everything mentionable, and should have treated every topic as exhaustively and as systematically as does now the author of a text-book for colleges and academies or even for the learned world. That such a law, custom, institution, person is not mentioned, is made to mean that the author knew nothing about it; and that, therefore, either he lived at a later date, or such things did not exist at the time. The critics seem to forget that writers frequently do not mention things which, nevertheless, must have been as familiar to them as their own names. Not to be superfluous, writers often pass over in silence, or but slightly notice, the most important events. No one would now seriously venture to inform us, that Mr. Cleveland is the President of the United States. The "Argumenta e Silentio" are proverbially inconclusive. If, in the distant future, the same unreliable critical principles are applied to our early American history, where shall we be? On the pedestal of a monument erected to the

memory of Thomas Jefferson, at Monticello, in Virginia, there is this inscription: "Thos. Jefferson, Author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the Statute for Religious Liberty and Founder of the University of Virginia." And yet, strange as it may appear, not so much as one word about his having been President of the United States.

If two thousand or three thousand years hence this monument comes under the notice of some of the "Higher Critics" of the future, it will be considered "confirmation strong as Holy Writ" that Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States, was quite a different man from Thomas Jefferson, Framer of the Declaration of Independence.

Besides, the inconsistencies which we are inclined to ascribe to the *historian* are really found in the *facts*, over which he has no control. The historian does not *make* the facts of history; he *relates* them. In the Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson, we read: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Yet it is not the fault of the historian, who informs us that while these words were being penned and adopted, the slave trade was carried on, not only in the Southern States, but also in New England, and even in Massachusetts. Yet, no doubt, some thousands of years hence, relying on the words of this Declaration, some critic of the day will prove to his own satisfaction that this Declaration of Independence was written by Thomas Jefferson only after the Proclamation of Emancipation by Abraham Lincoln during the late civil war.

Another baseless assumption of negative critics is that the general principles of Atheistic and Deistic evolution, admitted by many scientists to account for the origin of the various species of plants and animals, should also be applied to explain the origin of the Christian religion. This absurd theory is based on the denial of the possibility and of the consequent existence of the supernatural order. This is their fixed and unalterable principle, before which even facts must give way. This explains the seeming want of candor in some of the critics, and why they meet with evasive answers the clearest proofs which run counter to their own theory. It is because, to their mind, any solution, however improbable, of a difficulty is antecedently more probable than the occurrence of the supernatural. They allow this philosophical bias to warp their judgment to such an extent as to interfere with the results of historical research. They entertain an *a priori* conviction of the impossibility of miracles and prophecies. To this pre-conceived

theory they adjust the documentary evidence, and the final result is, of course, in perfect harmony with the theories with which they first set out. But is it not manifestly unreasonable to allow considerations of a *philosophical* character to enter into the discussion of such *historical* problems as, for instance, the date of composition of a book? That a book contains an account of miraculous events does not prove that such book was not composed by a writer contemporary with the events related. We have in our own day similar narratives written when and where the events are said to have occurred. The accounts may be true or false. That is another question. But what is insisted upon is that miraculous events can be recorded by a writer contemporary with the events, and that, therefore, the supernatural character of the contents of a book need not have anything to do with its date of composition. The life of St. Martin of Tours, though full of the marvellous, was written by his friend and contemporary Sulpicius Severus. What he wrote may or may not be true. Yet he wrote it. Hence the difficulty of understanding how a man, who bases his historical criticism on the postulate of the utter impossibility of the supernatural, can be a critic at all. He may be a philosopher, and a bad one at that. But he is no critic, good or bad. An historical critic has to do with *facts* rather than with *theories*, and such theories as he advocates he should base on the facts, and not adjust the facts to his theories.

By a strange perversion of the proper meaning of the term it has come about that the critic that is in substantial agreement with the views on Scripture that have been prevalent among the great mass of Christians to the present day, is considered no critic at all, no matter how independently he may have arrived at his conclusions. He is a mere traditionalist. Only the radicals are the true critics. Yet, it is not at all evident that the adoption of a rationalistic philosophy should be an indispensable requisite to the study of "Higher Biblical Criticism;" nor is it by any means a self-evident truth that a belief in the power of God to reveal supernatural truths to his intelligent creatures should be considered proof of mental incapacity; or should be thought to unfit a man for the literary and historical researches connected with the study of the Word of God. It is not an established law of nature that every Christian critic is necessarily wrong, and that every rationalistic critic is ever and always in the right. What has belief in the power of God to reveal his will to man, to work miracles, or to foretell the future, got to do with one's ability to prove who wrote the last chapters of the prophet Isaias? All that can be reasonably demanded of the Christian critic is, that he should not allow his theological convictions to bias his scientific researches;

and, in turn, he has the same right to expect the rationalist to keep his philosophical prejudices out of his argument, and to keep in abeyance any mere subjective speculations that he may entertain about the impossibility of the supernatural order. Such philosophical opinions have no conceivable right to intrude themselves into the domain of literary and historical criticism. With radical critics, it may be a fundamental principle that divine revelation is impossible, that miracles are so many myths, and that prophecy is all "Vaticinium post eventum," but, even so, such are only speculative opinions, rejected by the majority of mankind, and repugnant to the essential relations of dominion and dependence that exist between the creator and the creature. It is, therefore, evident that to make this subjective speculation in philosophy an objective fact in historical research, is to introduce into historico-Biblical criticism an element wholly foreign to its nature, and to destroy the difference which exists between fact and fancy, and between subjective theory and objective reality. It is to make a substantial something out of an ethereal nothing. If the radical critic chooses to entertain such absurd notions, he is welcome to them; but let him not represent them as admitted fundamental principles, nor bring them forward as the corner-stone of an edifice to which they belong by no right or title.

This view is held by Professor Sanday, an authority on such subjects. He says: "It ought now to be distinctly understood, that the Higher Criticism of the Bible, *as such*, makes no assumptions of a philosophical or theological character, and certainly none which interferes with a full belief in the real objective inspiration of the books to which it is applied. It is what it professes to be, and it does what it professes to do, and nothing more. It discusses the authorship and date of composition of the Biblical books by the same methods as those by which it discusses the same questions in the case of a classic of profane literature. When the book to be examined is historical, it discusses also its value and character as history, but it does this on the grounds which come properly within the province of criticism, and it entirely refuses to be bound by the postulate of the impossibility of the supernatural. If there are critics who adopt this postulate, they do not do so *as critics*, and my own belief is, that by so doing they spoil their criticism."

Other critics there are who place but little reliance on any writing that contains an account of the supernatural. This miracle they reject as antecedently improbable; that, as not necessary to the end in view; the other, as not supported by sufficient testimony. At the bottom of all this there is a deep-seated distrust of all supernatural narratives; hence the unreasonable demand

that any account of the miraculous, to be believed, should be supported by evidence immeasurably stronger than that which would be judged sufficient to substantiate events which do not run counter to the ordinary experience of mankind. In all this there is much that seems antagonistic to the spirit of Christian faith; for while, in principle, the supernatural is not flatly denied, it is, in practice, timidly thrust into the background as a thing to be ashamed of and disagreeable to handle.

It cannot be admitted that researches conducted on principles so false as many of those used by the radical critics can lead to good results. They tell us that higher criticism has caused a new era to dawn upon the race; that the Christian world is in a state of chronic agitation over its results, and that everything old is soon to be swept into oblivion by the critical new broom. It is not too much to say that something like intimidation is practiced towards those who are bold enough to reserve their judgment and to doubt whether all these things be true or not. It is represented as proof of pitiable ignorance to refuse to accept implicitly all that the critics would have us believe. The consequence is, that many profess adhesion to the critics' hypotheses, and accept them as scientifically established, not because they have ever understood them, but for fear of being behind the times, and appearing unscientific and uncritical. The slavery is all the more unjustifiable, because exercised by those who have no divine authority to teach. It is much like a game of bluff in which a few daring men call upon Christians to surrender all they possess. But we should be in no hurry to abandon our position. We are in possession, which is nine points of the law. The burden of proof rests upon the negative critics. Of course, the discovery of every new truth should be welcome to every honest man; and it would be wrong to dispute, or wilfully to ignore, the facts, as do some of the negative critics, because of a theory; but we are in no danger of thus acting, so long as the so-called results of destructive criticism do not rest on clearly established facts. But what, in point of fact, are the results of higher Biblical criticism? Of conservative criticism, much good; of destructive criticism, some good, much plausible conjecture, and many specious hypotheses.

Dr. Driver, of Oxford, informs us, by way of admission, that Moses was the ultimate founder of the national and religious life in the Hebrew commonwealth. Here is one good result for which we should be thankful to Dr. Driver's higher criticism. But not to him alone, for he informs us that this rehabilitation of Moses has the support of Julius Wellhausen, and that their joint verdict has the "endorsement of Abraham Kuenen." What would ever have become of Moses in the other world if his existence had not

been "endorsed by Kuenen?" But now Moses is safe. Accordingly, the wag was right when he said that he "had paid fifty cents to hear what Ingersoll had to say about Moses; but that he would pay fifty dollars to hear what Moses had to say about Ingersoll."

Mr. H. L. Hastings in a formidable list, gives us as among the results of Higher Criticism some of the discordant hypotheses published since 1850 on the origin and authorship of the Old and New Testament Books. For Genesis there have been 16 theories, Exodus 13, Leviticus 22, Numbers 8, Deuteronomy, 17; total for Pentateuch, 76 theories. For Joshua 10, Judges 7, Ruth 4, Samuel 20, Kings 24, Chronicles 17, Esdras 14, Nehemias, 11, Esther, 6; total for Historical Books, 113. For Job 26, Psalms 19, Proverbs 24, Ecclesiastes 21, Canticle of Canticles, 18; total for Poetical Books, 108. For Isaias 27, Jeremiah 24, Lamentations 10, Esechiel 15, Daniel, 22; total for Great Prophets, 98; for all the Minor Prophets, 144; total for the Old Testament, 599. For Matthew 10, Luke 9, Mark 7, John, 15; total for Gospels, 41. Acts 12, Paul's Epistles 111, other Epistles, 44; total for New Testament, 208. Grand total of theories for the entire Bible, 747. Of these 609 have already gone into oblivion, and there is no reason to fear that many of the remaining 144 may not soon follow them to the shelves of the libraries, to be dusted no more.

Thus we see that not all the principles of modern Higher Biblical Criticism will stand an examination. Baseless assumptions have been placed on a level with ascertained facts; hasty conclusions have been put forward as principles of science; and we have been called upon to accept the unwarranted prepossessions of critics, uninspired men like ourselves, as the revelation of a new Gospel. It will be admitted that we have the right to protest against the arrogance and the dictatorial tone with which so many negative critics would convey the impression that, because they have chosen to assume a position and advocate theories, therefore, we, without further discussion, must consider ourselves obliged to accept their word as final. No real Pope was ever so loud as they in proclaiming the dogma of their own infallibility. But in all this, the fault lies, not so much with the true Higher Criticism, as it does with the Higher Critics.

CHAS. P. GRANNAN, D.D., PH.D.

(CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D. C.)

THE MAID OF ORLEANS AND THE NEW WOMANHOOD.

La Vraie Jeanne d'Arc. La Paysanne et l'Inspirée, d'apres ses aveux, les temoins oculaires et la libre-pensée. Par *Pere J. B. J. Ayroles, S. J.* Gaume & Cie: Paris.
Jeanne d'Arc sur les Autels. Par le même.
La Pucelle devant l'Eglise de son temps. Par le même.
The New Womanhood. J. C. Fernald.

THE interest manifested in the cause of Joan of Arc, not only in France but throughout the world, calls forth a reflection upon the reasons of this almost unexpected agitation in which the Church plays a leading part. It may be explained in various ways according to different points of view, but there is one interpretation which seems quite unmistakable and of deep significance. The movement shows plainly the attitude of the Catholic Church towards what is called the *Woman Question.*

This question, requiring, as it does, an answer as to the rightful bounds of woman's sphere amid the rapid and astonishing developments of our modern civilization, is one of the most obtrusive among the social problems of the day. It may be briefly characterized as an effort to secure greater self-dependence (independence from man), recognition (on an equal basis with man) of woman's services in the economic and business spheres, as well as in the liberal professions, and, thirdly, political rights.

How far and under what circumstances these claims are admissible, constitutes the central knot of the problem. Widely contrasting solutions are presented on the one hand by the advocates of "woman's rights," and, on the other, by the more conservative defenders of the womanly prerogatives which, whilst placing her out of *concours* with man in manly spheres, put her above him in her own. The extremists' opinions are heard daily from platform and lecture-halls, at women's clubs and in the public press. They tend towards sweeping away every barrier that marks a dividing line between the sexes, even as to the matter of a distinctive dress, look to the polls as an essential means of remedying their wrongs, and have expectations of some day seeing a member of the sex appointed by popular vote Chief Executive of the Nation. The more conservative element, acknowledging the necessity that frequently forces woman to become self-supporting, and recognizing her ability to command success in whatever field she enters, still

deplores that necessity and clings to the belief that home is woman's true realm. A non-Catholic writer of our day gives a strong exposition of this view: "Woman's mental as surely as her physical qualities call her to the home life as her special and peculiar work. It is not that she can do nothing else, but that she can do this as no other can. If she does not make home, home cannot be made. The world needs her there. . . . . The world's civilization, the moulding of the ages to come, depend on the distinctively womanly qualities of mind acting in their highest beauty and perfection in human homes."[1]

As in all other questions and problems that affect the true welfare of man, the Catholic Church is interested in this one and has her solution of it. Her answers, although often seemingly conservative and tardily given, are always practical, and whilst meeting the new needs, anticipate those which lie ahead of the advancing race of men; for, as has been well said by a keen observer of our national, social, and moral life: "The true Church does not borrow truth from races and civilizations, but imparts it."[2]

The influence by which the Church effects a solution of social problems is twofold. First, by her teaching. Thus we explain the development of dogma. A new definition of some article of faith implies, as a rule, that the Church wishes to meet some popular error, intellectual or moral, by opposing to it some truth that will arouse the attention of her children and preserve them from the contagion of a false opinion. In this way the dogma of Papal Infallibility met the universal skepticism in matters of religion by pitting a reliable defining voice of truth against the wranglings of doubt, just as the definition of the Immaculate Conception raised the standard of pure womanhood as a signal of opposition to the false maxims of the era that threaten the very foundations of Christian families and homes.

The second means by which the Church exercises her influence upon the social body in order to correct and remedy a dangerous moral tendency, is to awaken enthusiasm in behalf of a noble ideal, represented by some hero or heroine upon whose brow she places the diadem of sanctity, and thus directs the aspirations of her children to the imitation of a great and lofty model.

Such is the aim of the divinely guided and inspired Church in selecting the saintly Maid of Orleans as a candidate for canonization. It is an ideal most in harmony with that of the "New Womanhood," and the aim of this paper is to point out how every legitimate aspiration of the sex is verified and emphasized in the fair and noble figure of Jeanne d'Arc.

---

[1] J. C. Fernald, *The New Womanhood.*

[2] Hecker, *The Church and the Age*, chap. xi.

Not as if we believed that every woman in our day might undertake what the French heroine was called to do by a special design of Providence—the virtues of the saints, not their actions, are for our imitation—but to show in the recitation of some of the more striking and relevant features of her life that every womanly grace and virtue is compatible with noble and chivalrous deeds, and that an unselfish patriotism has the full sanction of heaven, not only recognized by the Church, but ennobled and immortalized by her as worthy of proportionate imitation.

In doing this a contrast will incidentally be drawn between the holy independence of Joan of Arc (in the first stage of her young life) and the claims of the "Woman's Rights" party in our day; further to show the purpose that animated her in assuming the warrior's garb and the leader's task, and on the other hand women's present aspirations to political and professional rights; then to point out the self-sacrificing spirit of the Maid in her martyrdom, and the self-glorification of the modern society woman whose aim is to escape the so-called degradation of her sex; and, finally to draw attention to the victory of Joan which renders her immortal, as opposed to the empty sounds of a passing eulogy accorded those who seek victory not for their country and in God's cause, but from a more selfish motive.

I.

No woman of the present time who steps into the arena of public life, shows greater independence than did the Maid of Orleans when, forced by a divinely-appointed vocation, she began that extraordinary career which has made her one of the most striking figures in history. None of her sex, however, could feel more reluctance to assume a conspicuous rôle, could shrink so humbly from a great mission, nor cling with such lingering regret to family and home as did this gentle shepherdess. It was only obedience to an emphatic and unmistakable command from heaven that at length made her bid adieu forever to the scenes of her childhood and go forth to the rescue of her king and country.

A strange novitiate for her after career is that which her biographers trace for us in the record of those early years! And yet scarcely so. Strange, perhaps, if we look solely at the mail-clad warrior and the intrepid knight, the inspirer of armies and the champion of battles; but most congruous if we turn our gaze upon the tortured captive in prison-cell, the heroic martyr amidst the scorching flames in the market-place of old Rouen, the "Venerable Servant of God" on the calendar of the Church. For solitude is often the most congenial atmosphere for the development of strength of character, simplicity and lowliness form the firmest

foundation for future greatness, and a good Christian home is the best nursery not only for the gentler virtues but also for those that upon occasion may become heroic. Joan had a good home. She had good parents,—poor in the wealth of this world, but noted, even in a devout neighborhood, for their exemplary life and fervent piety. In the panorama of our heroine's life, the pictures of her childhood and youth are fair and beautiful. They fade from the canvas all too quickly. The first glimpse we catch of her is among the sloping hills or in the sunlit valleys or the deep shadows of the forest at Domremy in Lorraine,—a lovable child with soft dark eyes, so beautiful in their expression, old chroniclers tell us, that angry beasts were subdued by her glance; so gentle a little maid that the birds of the air flocked about her and took their food from her hands. Later we see her at her mother's side learning household duties as well as to spin and to sew. An apt scholar she must have been, for in the two latter accomplishments she became as proficient as any woman of her time and country.[1] These thoroughly feminine occupations, together with a knowledge of the Pater, Ave and Credo and of her religious duties, formed the sum total of Jeanette's education. A meagre curriculum, truly, and quite enough to excite the scornful pity of our college-bred girls. Education is a most desirable blessing provided it performs its threefold duty of training simultaneously the moral, mental and physical being. Joan could neither read nor write, she never opened a book, yet she considered herself by no means ignorant.[2] Better, far better her illiterateness with her pure soul, useful hands and robust body than the highest mental culture with distaste or inability for needlework,—that most beautiful of accomplishments for women,—a perverted sense of moral obligations and a shallow free-thinking habit. Fernald has something apposite to say on this subject: "There are some who aver that all the feminine qualities we have sketched are the result of education, and they are going to educate them out of woman, and the heart of every man answers, 'Now God forbid!'" . . . . So he opposes any proposed reconstruction of woman, which would turn all that admired half of the race into a second edition of men. "If education has made her the beautiful and gracious being she is, only let us know exactly what education has done it, and we will defend just that style of education against all comers, and maintain it while the earth remaineth. . . . . Far better was the old red school-house, with its 'Three R's' and no worries, sending home a red-cheeked girl to do

[1] "Elle savait coudre et filer aussi bien que femme de France."—*Interrogatoire* des 22 et 23 fèvrier, *Procès*.

[2] "J'ai pris ma crèance et ai ètè enseignèe bien et düment, comme on bon enfant doit faire."—*Procès* t. I, p. 209.

whatever might be to do in kitchen, or dairy, or bedroom or parlor —a working, skipping, merry lass, growing to useful womanhood with bounding health, and scattering help all the way along. Yes, a few studies thoroughly learned, knowledge of actual life attained, the conscious power of doing things that count in the world just as well as any one can do them, and hearty health to keep doing, advancing and enjoying, are worth a thousand times more than 'passing,' with pallid cheek, feeble hand and faltering step, the strictest written examination on a host of studies for which the learner knows no earthly use,—unless she can get paid to teach them over again to other poor souls to whom they shall be equally useless." One of Jeanette's heavenly instructresses, we may remark, was Saint Catharine of Alexandria who was versed in all the sciences of her day and successfully combated the celebrated Neo-Platonic philosophers of that famous school. Yet the future heroine was simply told to frequent the church and be a good child,—this was sufficient knowledge for the great work of saving her soul and her country. The history of Joan of Arc proclaims that faith without profuse learning is better than learning without faith, and that a simple heart given to God and enlightened and strengthened by divine grace, is mightier than all human wisdom and science.

Again, and most frequently, we find the peasant's daughter tending her father's sheep, weaving garlands of flowers meanwhile, wherewith to crown our Blessed Lady's statue, whilst her companions danced and sang in the innocent mirth of childhood, or, perhaps, leaving her gentle charges in some safe place, whilst she entered the church to pour forth her loving heart in prayer, or going, as she did at least every Saturday with her sister, on a little pilgrimage to the church of Notre Dame de Bermont.[1]

A wonderful picture now comes before us. We know it well, and never tire of looking at it. In its glowing colors we find the key to all the after marvels of that short eventful life. A girl of thirteen is working in her father's garden about the hour of noon; suddenly, she is enveloped in a light not of earth, angelic forms fill the air, one more superb and radiant than the others, and a voice is heard the sound of which is sweeter than softest music, telling the child to be good and to go often to church. The sounds

[1] Bermont, called also Belmont or Beaumont, was formerly a hospice for lepers, founded at the close of the thirteenth century by Pierre de Bourlêmont, Sieur de Domremy, at a time when leprosy, introduced from the Orient, had spread throughout Europe. In 1834, the chapel, which had fallen into ruin, was bought by M. Saincère, of Vaucouleurs, who had it restored. The statue of the Blessed Virgin, before which Jeanne and her sister so often prayed and burnt their tapers, is still to be seen in the choir.

were so sweet that Jeanne wept when they ceased, and begged St. Michael, for it was he, the tutelary angel of France, to take her with him. He bade her stay on earth, as God had a great work for her to do The girl's own voice must have caught the celestial tone, for all of her biographers allude to its remarkable sweetness. Could there be a better dower for a woman? This was the first of many visions that followed during four years. Saint Catherine and Saint Margaret were her especial guardians. Jeanne's mission was begun. "It is a history more romantic than romance itself would dare to be."—(Faber–Bethlehem.) Can we suppose it possible that the destiny of nations is to be moulded by those small clasped hands? that the deliverer for whom France has looked, and looked in vain, is to be found in that girlish form now kneeling with rapt, awe-struck countenance and tear-dimmed eyes? For, like those shepherds of old, who also saw a great light and heard voices from on high, Jeanne, too, was "sore afraid." Strange are the ways of divine Providence in ruling the nations. Thrice do we thus find God choosing peasant maidens, shepherdesses, of pure and simple lives, to save France from threatened dangers—Joan of Arc, in the fifteenth century, to rescue it from the English invader; St. Genevieve, a thousand years before, to defend Paris from the barbarians of the North; Barnadette, in our own generation, to oppose to the on-rushing tide of infidelity—a deadlier foe than the wild hordes of Attila—the miracles of faith at Lourdes.

Henceforth, nothing is changed outwardly in the girlish life. Jeanne is the same gentle creature, submissive to her parents, devoted to her friends, faithful to her duties, modest, and easily abashed.[1] Her companions can find nothing to reproach her with, save her piety. She goes daily to Mass, and to the evening service in the church near her home, often to the tribunal of penance, there to confess her sins with tears of contrition, and to the altar to fortify her soul with the bread of life. The afflicted are sure to receive sympathy from her, she cares for the sick and relieves the poor as best she can.[2]

Other scenes there are, occasionally, not so peaceful. Now and then, some roving band of Burgundian or English soldiers would appear in the neighborhood, and the young men of Domremy, which was decidedly Armagnac in its adherence, would go out to

[1] "C'était une excellente créature, somise a ses parents, et qui aimait tendrement ses amis; elle avait la réserve de son sexe, et s'intimidait facilement."—Testimony of Hauviette, an intimate friend of Joan.—*Procès.*

[2] "Elle était d'une piété exemplaire, elle allait volontiers a l'église et approchait souvent des Sacraments, elle soignait les malades, et donnait aux pauvres."—Deposition of Simon Musnier, laborer.—*Procès.*

repel the marauders. The tender heart of Jeanne was stirred with pity and indignation when she saw her friends and neighbors return bleeding and crippled from such encounters. On one occasion, we find her fleeing from her home, with her parents, before the enemy, and returning to find the church, that was so dear to her, reduced to ashes by their sacrilegious hands. These incidents served to strengthen her grief at the condition of her unhappy country. Nevertheless, viewed from the surface, hers appears rather an uneventful history—what in modern parlance would be called a "colorless" life. But underneath that quiet flow was an undercurrent of supernatural forces that was working such wonders as the world has seldom witnessed. The heavenly visitations became more frequent, the object of the mission more defined, the command to act more pronounced. Jeanne still hesitated. She told her great secret to no one, least of all could she entrust it to her father; but he suspected her, and set a close watch over her least she should escape from home. He was so determined to frustrate any such design on her part, that he ordered her brothers to drown her, if necessary, rather than let her go, and if they did not do so he would.[1] Physiologists, seeking traces of heredity, may find in this incident a source of that firmness of purpose and indomitable will that enabled the youthful heroine to overcome so many formidable obstacles to the accomplishment of her divinely appointed mission. From her mother, Isabeau Vauthon, whose surname of Romée was one usually given those who had made pilgrimage to the Eternal city, Jeanne doubtless inherited not only her loyal faith and fervent piety, but also the many graces and womanly traits that formed such striking and admirable contrasts in her noble character.

A time comes when Joan realizes that she must no longer delay. She bows before the will of God. The will of God! that was her guiding star, and perfect faith in the divine character of her call leads her to follow it on out of the grateful shadows into the bright glare of the world. The shrinking, the dread, the faint-heartedness, have all become merged into obedience. God has given her a mission; all else must be subordinate to that. A different spirit this from that which urges our young girls to leave the safe shelter of home for the sake of being independent, to escape the monotonous round of lowly duties, or the restraints of parental guidance. "I have fitted the girls for a life-work." It is a mother who speaks and a mother who is forced to do and to be in the unceasing battle of life. "But I shall not force them into it while I have

[1] "Si je cuidoye que la chose advensit que j'ay songiè d'elle, je vouldroye que la noyessiés, et se vous ne le faisiés, je la noieroye moy-mesme."—Interrogatoire du 12 Mars.—*Procès.*

strength and ability to earn their living. Knowing the world as I do; cognizant, as I cannot fail to be, of its grime and greed, I would no more send them out into it than I would push a boy into Niagara because he knew how to swim. . . . . You may talk as you choose about the beauty of independence, and the glory of being self-supporting; but a great deal of your talk springs from ignorance pure and simple. Ten times out of eleven the girl who goes out into the world, *unnecessarily*, to earn a living, hardens, and, most generally, in the other case, her heart breaks. . . . . Good shepherds and good mothers guard their lambs. We do not need a larger liberty for our girls so much to-day as we need better care-takers. Bye-and-bye the necessity will come that tests their courage and their strength. See to it, if possible, in their days of earliest youth that we preserve their hearts pure and their minds undefiled. A gently-reared, delicate-minded, pure, natural woman will always wield a greater power and command a higher place in the world than a bold, pushing, self-assertive one."

II.

"*Gesta Dei per puellam.*" Unless we believe this assertion, so well supported by the strongest and most incontestable proofs, it were impossible to account for the marvelous achievements accomplished by the Maid of Orleans in her brief career as the saviour of France. Patriotism is one of the noblest motives that can stimulate human action. To attain its highest estate, it must, however, be chastened and consecrated by the love of God. Love of country forms as integral a portion of woman's nature as it does of man's. It may smoulder unsuspected in her heart during times of peace and prosperity, but in a crisis it flames out into such deeds of heroism as have illumined the pages of history with some of its most brilliant exploits, rendering the doers of them immortal in the annals of the world. In Joan of Arc we find an example of patriotism of the most exalted type. That she undertook her mission in obedience to a heavenly inspiration, manifested by directly supernatural means, is a fact which satisfies one of those indispensable requisites to justify woman in claiming prerogatives which otherwise lie beyond her sphere. "It is by order of God that I went to the king. . . . . I would rather have been drawn asunder by horses than to have gone to him without the permission of God, in whose hands are all my actions," testifies the prisoner during her trial. And speaking of the saints and angels who acted as the divine messengers: "I saw them with my own eyes as plainly as I see you, my judges, and I believe what they said and did as firmly as I believe in the Passion and death of Jesus Christ, our Saviour." There is no uncertain ring in the expression of this

conviction. Without this stamp of the divine authorization, the career of the Maid of Orleans as a military leader would never have received the sanction of the Church. This remark must not be understood as a wish to limit unduly the legitimate field of woman's activity, or to make the Church responsible for a view that might seem contrary to the progressive movement of our day, which assigns to woman a larger sphere of action than was formerly the case. The aspirations of our sex to take part in public life, or in those interests which are of a professional nature, are not to be condemned so long as they lie within the range of woman's actual ability. "We hear much said," writes the eminent Paulist, Father Hecker, "and not a little is written, in the United States and in England, about the exclusion of women from spheres of action for which her natural aptitudes make her equal, and in many cases render her superior, to man; of her partial education, and in many cases the inferior position which she is forced to accept in society.

"Strange that we hear no such complaints in Catholic society or from Catholic women! Is it because they have been taught to hug the chains which make them slaves? or that they are denied liberty of speech? or that their lips are closed by arbitrary authority? Not at all. The reason is plain. Women, no less than men, are free to occupy any position whose duties and functions they have the intelligence or aptitude to fulfill. They have the opportunities, and are free to obtain the highest education their capacities are capable of. This every Catholic woman knows and feels, and hence the absence of all consciousness in the Church of being deprived of her rights, of oppression, and of injustice.

"One has but to open his eyes and read the pages of ecclesiastical history to be convinced that in the Catholic Church there has been no lack of freedom of action for women. . . . . There is no kind of labor, literary, scientific, mechanical, as well as charitable, in which they may not engage according to their abilities and strength. . . . . All roads in the Church are open to woman's energies and capacities, and she knows and is conscious of this freedom; and, what is more, she is equally aware that whatever she has ability to do will receive from the Church encouragement, sanction, and that honor which is due to her labor, her devotion and her genius."

This is surely allowing women the widest possible range, and we fear that many of those brought up in the conservative views of a generation not without its beneficial influence in modern society, will consider it more than a safe concession in practice. Yet note the important limitation that "they have the intelligence or aptitude to fulfil." Woman, as a rule, and by reason of her natural constitution of mind and body, cannot be said to have the

capacity or aptitude to fulfil satisfactorily the functions demanded from a leader of men either in the political or military sphere. Vocations to a conspicuous rôle, such as that of Joan of Arc, are an exception rather than a rule among women; and as exceptions they but emphasize the rule. The ordinary way of divine Providence is to guard the daughters of the Church in the safe harbor of the home or the cloister, rather than to launch them, unless necessity compels, among the breakers of public life among men and in distinctively manly pursuits. Occasionally, even in our day, it places in a woman's hand the actual weapons of war,[1] generally, it prefers to see her labor for the good of others with pen or needle rather than with sword or firearms; and when it conducts her to the field of battle, as the records of war in every country of the world testify that it often does, we find her there not in the war-like uniform of a combatant, but in the sombre habit of a Sister of Mercy or of Charity. Woman's scenes of contest are oftenest within her own heart; there must ever be won her most signal victories. Many a struggle is fought, many a silent conquest gained there, more glorious than Patay or Orleans, of which God is the sole witness, the recording angel the only historian. Heroines in private life are many in comparison to those of whom the world hears and sings the praise. It is not to be forgotten that the woman of truly heroic mould, called to serve her country in any public capacity must invariably retain the womanly qualities which mark her as belonging to a different, if not inferior order of beings. The saintly Maid of Orleans is an evidence of how a woman when called by God to a masculine sphere, may still preserve an attraction for her own and carry into the new mode of life all the lovely characteristics of pure womanhood. One phrase from her own lips testifies strongly in her favor in this respect: "War is not my condition," she asserts, "certes, I would rather be at home spinning beside my poor mother, but I must go and do battle; for such is the will of my Lord."

It is not essential to enter here upon a lengthy description of the political condition of France during the early years of the fifteenth century. It will suffice for our purpose to remind the reader of the disastrous situation which arose out of the claims of Edward III. of England to the French throne; of the hundred years of strife that resulted therefrom; of Crécy, Poitiers, Agincourt and many lesser fields upon which the pride of French chivalry had perished; of the wide swathes cut by famine and

[1] A late dispatch from Berlin contains the following: "Official and private reports on the recent revolt of natives in the Cameroons call attention to the great heroism of Margaret Leuse, a Sister of Mercy, who passed through the thick of the fighting armed with only a revolver, and tended to the wounded in the midst of a hail of bullets."

pestilence in the ranks of those whom war had spared.[1] Then, too, of the insanity of Charles VI., of the infamous treaty of Troyes, the unnatural conduct of Queen Isabella in signing away the rights of her son, Charles VII., in favor of Henry V. of England, and of the civil war between the houses of Orleans and Burgundy, of the alliance of the latter with the English. When we recall these facts we can hardly consider Disraeli's scornful boast an exaggeration: "Our Henry V.," he says, "had reduced the kingdom of France to the town of Bourges."

Upon the death of Charles in 1422, Henry VI., son and successor to Henry V., was proclaimed king of England and France. As he was only a child, his uncle, the Duke of Bedford, was appointed regent in France. In 1429 all the northern portion of the realm, including Paris, was in the possession of England. A few southern provinces were all that could be claimed by the Dauphin, Charles VII., and he had neither troops nor resources to defend these against his enemies. Orleans had been in a state of siege for months; it seemed inevitable that it must soon capitulate, and when that happened the doom of France was sealed. Charles, called in derison, "King of Bourges," had retired to Chinon, and was determined that, as soon as Orleans fell, he would abandon his unhappy kingdom and seek an honorable asylum in Spain or Scotland.

The disheartening defeat of Rouvray-Saint-Denis added to the hopelessness of the situation. The soldiers were demoralized, the chiefs disheartened. It seemed a question of only a month or two when France must become what Canada is to-day, a province of England. It was at this critical moment that God sent the French a deliverer in the person of the virgin-knight, Joan of Arc.

We last saw Jeanne at the humble home by the Meuse. In obedience to the directions of her Saints, she departed from it and went to Sieur Robert de Beaudricourt, Captain of the King's forces at Vaucouleurs, to tell him the work she was appointed to do, and to ask him to send her to the King. When he heard her announce that she, an ignorant peasant girl of seventeen, was commissioned to raise the siege of Orleans and to lead the Dauphin to Rheims to be crowned, he thought her a fool or mad. Thrice was

[2] Petrarch, whilst in France, writing probably about the middle of the fourteenth century, thus describes the sad condition of the realm: "Nothing presented itself to my eyes but a fearful solitude, an extreme poverty, lands uncultivated, houses in ruins. Even the neighborhood of Paris manifested everywhere marks of destruction and conflagration. The streets are deserted, the roads overgrown with weeds, the whole is a vast solitude." And Des Serres, describing the unhappy kingdom at the close of the same century, gives a similar picture: "In sooth the estate of France was most miserable. There appeared nothing but a horrible face, confusion, poverty, desolation, solitarinesse and feare."

she rebuffed, thrice did she return to urge her request. She did not lose courage. Faith had been her inspiration, hope was now her support. When her mission was first definitely made known to her, timid little Jeannette had wept and remonstrated, saying that she was only a poor girl and did not know how to ride or make war. The answer of the Saints was: Have no doubts; God will be your aid. Whenceforth we see no more faltering. "Before Lent is over I must be with the King," she says, "if I have to wear my legs off to the knee, for there is no one in the world who can save France but myself."

Jeanne's piety during the wearisome delay at Vaucouleurs was the admiration of the city. She spent much time in church praying fervently, she fasted rigorously, she went frequently to confession and communion. She staid at the house of a wheelwright, whose wife became deeply attached to the saintly girl. Here a short digression may be made to recall a fact of which all women may feel proud. In the history of the Maid of Orleans no mention is made of a woman being found in the ranks of her enemies. They were ever her friends, and the witnesses to her devout and spotless life. We have only to mention the Queen, Marie of Anjou, who received her with the greatest kindness, Yolande of Aragon, Queen of Sicily, and the other noble ladies who testified as to her virtue before the king would believe in her inspiration; the wife and saintly aunt of John of Luxembourg who pleaded with him in her behalf; the peasant woman who was burnt at the stake in Paris at the time Joan suffered a like fate, for declaring her faith in the Maid's goodness and the reality of her mission.

Gradually her holiness, her courage and confidence, began to bring conviction to the minds of the people of Vaucouleurs and of the surrounding country. They recalled, too, and Jeanne herself often spoke of it, an ancient prophecy which foretold that the harm done to France by one woman should be repaired by a chaste virgin: "La France perdue par une femme sera relevée par une vièrge venue des marches de Lorraine." What more natural than that this prediction should be applied to Isabelle of Bavaria and to the shepherdess of Domremy? This strengthened her cause. Robert de Baudricourt at length yielded. The Maid had spoken to him of the defeat of the royal forces at Rouvray and predicted that if he did not send her to the King some worse thing would happen. A day after, the news reached him of the lost battle, and he feared any further hesitation. So the day at last comes when Jeanne's hopes are realized, and she is on her way to the court, accompanied by one of her brothers and under the care of John of Metz and Bertrand of Polengy, two noble knights who have sworn to conduct her safely to the King. Before the departure, Isabelle

Romée came to Vaucouleurs to grant the coveted forgiveness to her eldest daughter, her dear Jeannette, for having fled from home without her permission, and to bid her what proved to be a last adieu. Twice again do Joan's biographers mention this loving and good mother. Shortly after her sad parting with Jeanette, we hear of her at the distant shrine of Notre Dame du Puy whither she has gone to attend the exercises of a jubilee;[1] and more than twenty-five years later she appears before the Commissioners whose reversal of the former trial rehabilitated the heroine's memory; she is now aged, clothed in widow's garb and leans on the arms of her sons.

Briefly must we pass over the interview with Charles VII. at Chinon; the proofs she gave him of the divine source of her mission; her examination and triumph before the States General Council at Poitiers. Asked for a proof in support of her claims, that is for a miracle, she had told them she would give it at Orleans. And to Orleans they finally allowed her to go, with a large supply of provisions for the beleaguered city and at the head of an army of ten thousand men. The humble girl who appeared before the Sieur de Beaudricourt in her coarse red peasant's dress, is now transformed into a knight of France, attended by a suite befitting her rank as a chief in the army, clad in a suit of rich armor made for her by order of the king, riding a noble horse with the grace of a practiced cavalier, wearing the sword of Saint Catharine, and carrying a silvery banner inscribed with the names of Jesus and Mary and embroidered with the fleurs de lys. The almost incredible feats of valor at Orleans and the speedy relief of the besieged city; the astonishing and chivalrous deeds that opened the route to Rheims for the Dauphin through a country beset by his enemies; the magnificent ceremonial at the coronation of the King; these brilliant incidents close the short chapter of the Maid's successes, though not of her bravery and heroism. Henceforth she enters upon a different road to glory and the shadows begin to fall.

The devotional features of Joan's life in camp and afield would almost lead one to suppose they were those of a member of a religious order. Everywhere and at all times we find that beneath

[1] Whenever Good Friday fell on the 25th of March, France enjoyed the privilege of a grand jubilee. This occurred in 1429. Many of the devout looked to the jubilee as a means of obtaining deliverance from the evils that oppressed their unhappy country. The duration of the Great Pardon had on this occasion been extended by the Pope, Martin V. at the request of Charles VII., to April 3d. Jeanne was then before the Commission at Poitiers and therefore could not go to Notre Dame du Puy, but not only was she represented by her mother, but also by the two knights who accompanied her from Vaucouleurs. It is supposed that the Maid exacted a promise from each of them to be present.

the warrior's coat of mail beat the same fervent, devout, humble heart of the simple shepherdess of Domremy. The honors that were showered upon her served but to make her more earnest in the service of God. She assisted at the Holy Sacrifice whenever it was possible; she went to confession almost daily, and although many witnesses declared, during her trial, that no one had ever discerned the slightest fault in her conduct, she always gave evidence of the deepest contrition. In presence of the Blessed Sacrament, or when receiving it, she had the appearance of one inspired. Every evening bells were sounded to assemble the soldiers; prayers were then conducted by the priests, and hymns and canticles were sung in honor of God and His Blessed Mother. It is not surprising to learn that the saintly Maid tried to maintain strict discipline in the army. She forbade blasphemy and pillage, and punished them severely. Before leaving Blois *en route* for Orleans, she, by proclamation, ordered all the soldiers to make their peace with God and to promise to reform their lives, saying that if they were in a state of mortal sin, God would not permit them to be victorious. The same order was repeated and carried into effect after the English were forced to raise the siege of Orleans. She had prayers and Masses of thanksgiving offered immediately after this signal victory. The story is well known of how she had all the miserable female followers of the army driven away, and of how the sword she prized so highly was broken over the back of one of these creatures who brought disgrace on the name of woman and dishonored the virtue that the Maid held as the dearest treasure of her soul. She never spoke to men after sundown, seldom at any time, and kept aloof from them as much as possible. Only in battle did she mingle with them. It seems almost like a miracle, yet it was asserted under oath by Count Dunois, who was considered the most virtuous man in the army, and who had therefore been placed in special charge of the Maid by the king, that no one ever manifested the slightest wrongful sentiment towards her, and her very presence seemed to exhale an atmosphere of purity, and that all respected her as an angel.

Thus, when woman is destined to lead a manly life, she finds her greatest safeguard in fidelity to God and her religious duties. Self-respect will always command the respect of others, and no occupation is incompatible with the practice of the loftiest virtues. "Intelligence and liberty are not a hindrance, but a help to religious life," says the learned Paulist cited above; and, again: "Is divine grace given only at the cost of natural strength? Is a true Christian life possible only through the sacrifice of a successful career? . . . . The general history of the Catholic religion in the

past condemns these suppositions as the grossest errors and falsest calumnies." The distinction should, however, be sharply defined, in regard to entering professional callings or political fields, between positive duty and the gratification of an abnormal impulse or a desire for personal aggrandizement. The first justifies a woman; the egotistical motives can but abase her. The noble and exalted aspirations of the glorious Maid of Orleans are such as should animate any woman whose destiny leads her to become a champion for her country or her fellow-beings.

III.

The representatives of modern womanhood cannot wholly escape Balzac's epigrammatic and incisive thrust at human nature: "Glory is deified egotism." It is so easy for our much-neglected race to fall into the error of claiming too much, and thereby hurting the just demands in behalf of the sex. A concerted movement by women to bring about some much-needed reform of moral or social evils, to advance the good of humanity, or to raise the position of their kind to a loftier plane, must not be confounded with the restless attitude of the boisterous "reformers," whose immoderate claims endanger, as they disgrace, the very cause they so loudly profess to advocate. Let us again turn to the pages of Fernald: ".... Through the fevered discussion of the 'rights' of woman, which has been one of the striking phenomena of our day—surging upon the shores of our literature, our politics and our social life with much of false assertion and unreasonable demand—beating frantically sometimes against barriers of political economy and social morality, whose fall would unsettle the very foundations of society—it cannot be doubted that a great tide of achievement for woman has been gaining ground. We gladly hail the good already done in the reform of barbarous laws and the opening of new opportunities of education and industry. But we have need to watch against that tendency to Nihilism which is the peril of all reforms. Some there are who would sweep away everything existing in order that their new theories might possess the ground alone. But Christian American womanhood, as it exists to-day, at this height of human advancement, is too fair and precious a treasure to be rashly flung into the crucible of any experiment in the hope that some better thing may come out."

A woman who plunges into the vortex of public life in order to shake off what she considers the shackles of home duties, who enters the field of manly activity because she prefers it to womanly pursuits, or who selects a masculine profession through choice rather than by necessity, has lost something of her normal nature. For the woman who is obliged to become self-supporting or to

maintain those dependent upon her and who strives to do this conscientiously wherever and however circumstances make her talents or qualifications most available, the world has sympathy, admiration, respect. For the arrogant, self-asserting, loud-voiced woman ranting about the wrongs of her sex and the tyranny of man and the laws he has made, no refined, well-bred person can feel aught but aversion and disgust. The difference between a woman acting and perfectly accomplishing a man's part in exceptional circumstances, and a woman aspiring to take man's part as her legitimate sphere of action, is the difference between exceptional effort and normal aspiration; in the one case it proceeds from an impulse either divine, as with Joan of Arc, or heroically human; and in the other, it is made the purpose of an education which aims at transplanting woman out of her sphere without compensating for the void thus created. The course of action taken by the Maid of Orleans was the result of supernatural interposition, and it was an exceptional effort made lawful by an unusual and extraordinary combination of circumstances. In adopting and pursuing it she was as self sacrificing as she was independent and courageous. Unselfish devotion to a noble cause, such as hers, generally attains its object, whilst incidentally it commands the reverence and homage of friend and foe alike. Yet, in how many instances does it not lead to self-immolation, to martyrdom?

The final scenes in the life of our heroine bring home to us the fact that the triple love of her heart,—so blended that it was but one love,—love of God, her king and her country, survived suffering and triumphed over death. Great as she was in battle, Joan of Arc seems greater still during her cruel imprisonment, her harassing trial, and the dreadful tragedy that closed her wonderful life. The details of those months of agony would alone plead touchingly and irresistibly that to all her other glorious titles the Church will soon add the still more glorious one of Saint.

During the triumphal entry of Charles VII. into Rheims and at the brilliant ceremony of the coronation in the venerable cathedral, the virgin-knight had attained the acme of her earthly fame. She rode beside her king in the procession and shared with him the enthusiastic ovation given by the citizens. During the coronation function she again occupied a place of honor at his side and was the cynosure of all eyes. Fair indeed she is to look upon, her lithe and robust form clothed in shining armor, her head unhelmeted, her dark ringlets falling to her shoulders, her soft eyes luminous with happiness, her hand supporting the consecrated banner that had so often led the French troops on to victory. Was the shepherdess blinded by the bright sunshine of prosperity? Did the peasant's daughter forget from the dizzy

heights of renown the humble cottage at Domremy? No! In prosperity as in adversity, in the days of happiness as in the days of misfortune, there is ever the same simplicity and humility, the same pathetic yearning for parents and home and for the lowly occupations of her former peaceful life. After the coronation, the heroine of the hour cast herself at the feet of Charles, and with tears in her eyes exclaimed: "Now, gentle king, the good pleasure of God is accomplished, that you should come to Rheims to be consecrated and thus show that you are the true king to whom belongs the kingdom," and then she added: "I would that I could go back now to my father and mother, to serve them and to tend their flocks with my sister and brothers,—they would be very glad to see me." But her inspiring presence was considered necessary in the army and Charles refused her request, although it was repeated several times.

Upon another occasion, moved at sight of the loyalty of the country people who flocked in large numbers to see their king and the renowned Maid, she said to Dunois who rode beside her: "My God! but these poor people are good and devoted; there are no others to compare with them. I wish if it were the will of God, it might be my lot to die and be buried in these parts." "Do you expect to die soon, Jeanne?" he asked. Her response was that she would not last more than a year, scarcely that. Ten months thereafter she was taken prisoner.

Whilst the army was at Rheims, Jeanne's father and the uncle who had taken her to Robert de Beaudricourt, and also several of the old friends and companions from Domremy, came to see her. It was probably Jacques d'Arc's last meeting with the daughter whose valor has made his name rank not only among the nobility of the land she saved, but caused it to become famous for all time throughout the world. "Are you not afraid of being killed in war?" queried one of the young peasants. "My only fear is of treachery," replied the Maid. The words were prophetic.

The treachery came at Compiègne on the 23d May, 1430. The city was besieged by the English and their French allies. A sortie, lead by Jeanne, was to be made that day against the enemy. She assisted at Mass and received Holy Communion. She afterwards remarked to some companions: "I shall soon be betrayed, sold, and delivered over to death. I beseech you to pray for me." The attack was made, but, notwithstanding the prodigies of valor performed by the heroic girl, proved unsuccessful, and the gallant band was forced to retreat. They found the gates of the city closed. Treachery! Jeanne was surrounded by the enemy and had to surrender. She became the prisoner of John of Luxem-

bourg. Six months later the knight, after long hesitation, and owing principally to the misrepresentations of the ejected Bishop of Beauvais, Pierre Cauchon, accepted the sum offered by the English and sold his countrywoman, his prisoner of war, to the enemies whom she had so many times humiliated and who were thirsting for vengeance. They gladly paid a king's ransom for her.

The captive was taken to Rouen and placed in an English dungeon. Her treatment there exceeds belief. The heart quails and the cheek blanches at the thought of it. The physical endurance that in campaigns had made her the wonder of all who witnessed it, was now to be transmuted in the crucible of suffering into the Christian virtue of fortitude. In shame for our common humanity we draw a veil over the minutiæ of those terrible months of moral and physical torture. The contracted iron cage, made expressly for her; the iron chains around neck and waist and ankles, that by day fastened her to the wall and by night to her cot so tightly that it was impossible for her to move—these are but some of her bodily afflictions. Five English soldiers guarded her constantly; three in her cell, two outside of the door. All spiritual consolation was denied her. She was not allowed to assist at Mass nor to receive her Lord in the Blessed Eucharist. The chapel of the chateau had to be passed on the way from Jeanne's cell to the hall where her trial took place. She asked: "Is the Body of my Saviour there?" Being told it was, she entered and relieved her sorrowful heart in prayer. Her judges, hearing this, forbade her the privilege, and there was nothing left for the saintly girl to do but stop as she passed and to kneel and kiss the door through which she dare not enter to her Beloved. Day by day she stood before her judges, without counsel, and was plied with questions by those learned doctors—questions that it would have puzzled one of their own number to answer. Thus was she tortured in mind and in body. But all the cruelty of her jailers, all the subtlety and scheming and hatred of her judges could not force the courageous Joan to deny that her mission was divine. Her innocence, her candor, her patience acted as a foil to their satanic machinations.

Even when shown the instruments of torture and the executioner ready to use them on her wasted body, she could not be forced into an acknowledgment that she had been deluded or had sought to delude others. She was told that her obstinacy would cause the loss of her soul as well as the death of her body. "Even if I should be in the judgment," replied the dauntless Maid; "if I should see the fire lighted, the faggots prepared, the executioner ready; if I should be in the fire, I would maintain what I have said even in death."

And so the charges against Jeanne were pronounced proven and she must die. An explanation of the part taken by the schism-tainted and disloyal University of Paris, and by the unworthy churchman, Pierre Cauchon, whom the people of Beauvais had driven from his see because he was a creature of the English, in the execution of the Maid of Orleans, does not lie within the scope of this paper. It is an interesting history, though, and throws light on many things not otherwise comprehensible. We must hasten on to the last act in the mournful tragedy.

On the 24th of May the prisoner was taken to the cemetery of Ouen for sentence. By fraud she was induced to sign a paper purporting to be a promise not to wear masculine attire, nor to bear arms, and other things of like small importance. Jeanne not being able to write, put her mark to it. Another paper had been substituted for the one they read to her. This contained an acknowledgment that she had sworn falsely as to her visions and voices, that she had adored demons, and many more similar assertions. As she was now said to have retracted, her sentence was changed from one of death to perpetual imprisonment on bread and water. This was only a pretence at clemency. Jeanne was returned to her prison and there treated with greater insult and cruelty than before. She complained that she was beaten, dragged by the hair, and tormented in every possible way. Finding they could not succeed in making her break the promise she had made to wear only womanly garments, her jailors removed these at night whilst she slept, and left her nothing but men's clothes. These she was obliged to put on. Her judges entered her cell, said it was easy to see that she still clung to her illusions, and asked her if she had seen any more visions. Jeanne had already repented of her fears, and now heroically declared that she believed more firmly than ever the voices were from heaven; that she had not understood the abjuration; that she had signed it only through horror of death by fire, and that she would rather die than remain where she was. This sufficed. The court promptly declared she had relapsed.

The following morning, May 30, 1431, a Dominican priest, Martin l'Advenu, came to tell Jeanne she was to die that day at the stake. When she heard the horrible death in store for her, the brave heart was overcome by terror, and the poor girl wept piteously. Are we not reminded of another Heart, the source whence every heart that suffers must draw strength and courage, and which yet at the foresight of coming suffering throbbed with such anguish that the Sacred Blood was forced through the pores of the divine body! Soon, however, the poor victim became resigned and began to prepare for her dreadful doom. She made

her confession and begged to be allowed to receive the Holy Eucharist, so long denied her. After some discussion, Cauchon consented. Holy Communion to one condemned to death as a heretic and schismatic! By this contradiction the unscrupulous bishop and his party betrayed their inconsistency and injustice. A procession accompanied the Blessed Sacrament to the cell of the condemned chanting the litany for the agonizing, and at each response saying, "Pray for her." The scene was touching in the extreme, and the devotion and humble piety of the Maid when receiving her Viaticum edified all beholders. Shortly afterwards she was placed in the executioner's cart, and guarded by eight hundred armed soldiers, was taken to the Vieux-Marché where everything was in readiness for her execution.

Three platforms had been erected, one for the judges, another for church and state dignitaries, still another for the Maid of Orleans. A long sermon was preached by Nicholas Midi reproaching Jeanne for her relapse; she listened to it calmly and patiently. Then Cauchon addressed his victim, who had said to him: "Bishop, I die through you," and exhorted her to be truly repentant. Without waiting for the close of his harangue, Jeanne cast herself upon her knees and began to invoke the mercy of God and the assistance of the saints. In the name of the dying Saviour she implored all there present of whatever condition or party, to forgive her any offence she might have given them, as she on her part freely forgave all who had injured her. Could charity go further than this? Faith and hope were now perfected in charity. Faith and hope and charity, these three are one; but the greatest is charity. Was not Joan's Christ-like charity? To forgive not only the English who were dishonoring the code of civilized nations by executing a prisoner of war, but the French who had delivered her up to her enemies, the French who had condemned her, the French who raised not a lance, nay, not even a voice to save her from such a horrible fate.

Her sublime words were as a dagger in the breasts of her hearers. Her very judges could not restrain their tears. It was the greatest of the Maid's victories. She requested every priest there present to say a Mass for her soul and all the people to pray for her. She expressed a wish for a cross and an English soldier made one of sticks. She took it reverently, kissed it repeatedly, and placed it over her heart. She next begged one of the priests to bring the processional cross from the neighboring church and to hold it where she could see the figure of her expiring Saviour whilst she, too, was in her agony. The crowds grew tired of the delay and some one called to the executioner to do his duty. Joan was seized and roughly dragged towards the fatal pile of

faggots, placed upon it, tied to a stake and the fire was lighted. The Dominican stood at her side, forgetful of all save the soul committed to his care, until the flames began to ascend and poor Jeanette herself urged him to leave her. "Stand below, raise the cross that I may see it and speak pious words to me until the end come." She maintained to the very last, her confessor deposed, that the voices were from God, that whatever she had done was by the order of God, and that she did not believe the voices had misled her.

Those who heard the Maid protest her innocence from the midst of the flames, and who saw her enduring this horrible death with such noble fortitude were moved to compassion.

The flames crept slowly upward. As they enveloped her and scorched the shrinking flesh, Joan asked to be sprinkled with holy water. Once more she invoked the assistance of her heavenly Mother and of the saints, and thanked God, yes even in that moment of excruciating pain, thanked God for all the graces He had bestowed on her. The remorseless fire had well-nigh finished its deadly work. The dying head fell upon her breast, and with a cry of "Jesus, Jesus, Jesus," the soul of the martyr passed to its reward.

Consummatum est.

No craving for the applause of men, no desire for posthumous fame, can be detected in the career of the glorious Maid of Orleans. On the altar of a heaven-inspired duty she had immolated self. Devotedness was equalled by disinterestedness. Of the king and the country she had served so well, she asked nothing for herself or for those who were dear to her. The sole request she made of her celestial visitants was that she might be enabled to save her soul and thus be one day with them in Paradise. No trace of selfish ambition ever marred the beauty of the love that was the dominating impulse of her life. But the memory of such deeds, such virtues as hers cannot die: History records them, the Church crowns them. Hence the renown and glory never anticipated by the saintly heroine followed swiftly upon her ignominious death and have not only survived but augmented up to the present day.

The vindictiveness of Joan's enemies had to all appearance triumphed. It had calumniated her character, it had tortured her soul and body, it had burned her at the stake as a witch, a heretic and a seducer of the people.[1] Her heart would not yield to the

[1] A notice placed on a post at the place of execution gave this summary of the crimes imputed to her: *Jehanne qui s'est fait nommer la Pucelle, menteresse, pernicieuse, abuseresse du peuple,* divineresse, superstitieuse, blasphemeresse de Dieu, pré

fire, but by order of the English, it together with the ashes of the rest of the body, was thrown into the Seine that nothing might remain to become an object of veneration. Oblivion if possible, if not, at least execration and anathema. How vain the wicked designs of men! At the moment the martyr breathed her last a white dove was seen to issue from the flames and wend its way heavenward; the fact was attested by an English soldier who had so hated the Maid in life that he had sworn he would gladly with his own hands carry the wood wherewith to burn her. Her executioner was so overcome by remorse that he went at once to one of the friars and declared his sorrow for the part he had taken in the act, for he believed the victim to have been innocent and a saint. Many of those who were answerable for her condemnation came to an unhappy and tragic end, thus verifying the prediction of Joan that such would be the case. The patriotism she had revived in the hearts of her countrymen resulted in the final overthrow of English domination in France that she had prophesied. The people believed in her exalted memory, and showered maledictions on those who had compassed her sad end. A revision of her trial was begun some years after her cruel execution at the request of Charles VII. In 1455 the Pope, Calixtus III., appointed a commission to reinvestigate the records of the Process of 1431. It declared that the court which had tried and condemned the Maid had acted without jurisdiction and that its decisions were unjust, null and void. Joan of Arc was pronounced innocent of all the charges against her. This rehabilitation of her memory was received with joy and gratitude. At Rouen a grand fête was inaugurated, during which the announcement of the heroine's vindication was publicly read, processions took place in the squares and solemn services were held in the churches. This was followed by similar proceedings throughout the kingdom, the highest dignitaries of Church and State participating in them.

These demonstrations were the prelude, the first exultant notes, which thousands of voices soon united in swelling into a mighty anthem of praise and reparation to the saintly Maid of Orleans. The ages caught up the strain. It has been borne along by the sound waves of time, now rising, now falling into soft, low cadences, until now, in our day no heart, no nation but is attuned to add to its volume and most perfect harmony.[1]

---

somptueuse, malcréant de la foi de Jesus-Christ, vanteresse, idolâtre, cruelle, dissolue, invocateresse de diables, apostatesse, schismatique et hérétique.—Preuves de l'Hist. de la Ville de Paris, par dom Filibien.

[1] The eminent English Cardinal Monsg. Howard, was some years ago appointed prosecutor of the Cause of the Maid's Beatification. It is said that Queen Victoria, desiring to have before her eyes a model of purity, had painted a picture of Joan of Arc.

In the fifteenth century Joan of Arc was vindicated by the Church whose unworthy and unauthorized representatives had condemned her: in the nineteenth the chief representative of that Church, Leo XIII., ever watchful of the tendencies of the age, ever keen sighted as to the exigencies and dangers of the day, gives fresh *éclat* to the rehabilitation and adds to its effectiveness by pronouncing the object of it "worthy of veneration." The first degree in the process of canonization is attained, and the universal gratification expressed proves how popular is the decision. Throughout France preparations are being made to fittingly celebrate the great event as a national honor, and other countries will not be slow to follow the example thus set them.

The Church of God is endowed with perpetual youth. Centuries ebb away but leave no trace upon her nor take from her aught of vigor or of beauty. Hence that precipitation which so often mars human actions and warps human judgments finds no *raison d'être* in the councils and verdicts of the fair Spouse of Christ. Wisdom, carefulness, slow deliberation are the distinguishing marks of her proceedings. Nowhere are these characteristics more evident than in the process of canonization, which is never accomplished hastily, whilst frequently it extends over a period of many years. This fact is strongly emphasized in the case of our French heroine. Providence undoubtedly has some special design in the lateness of her Beatification. Is it presumptuous to venture a surmise? This is woman's age. She is coming to the front as never before. A spirit of restless activity pervades the sex. "Independence, equal rights, progress"—these the shibboleths of the New Womanhood. Dangers attend the onward movement, treacherous shoals, unsuspected pitfalls lie ahead. What wiser, then, what kinder, than to raise a standard, to present to the women of the new era a noble ideal in which they can find an example of the virtues necessary to them if they would pursue the newly opened highways in safety and honor?

This desideratum could not have been effected more appropriately than by the action of the Church in proclaiming in our day the cult of the Maid of Orleans. Her history proves that this much-vaunted nineteenth century, with all its advanced ideas, can furnish no substitute for home, can place a woman in no position where her influence is so indispensable, so far-reaching, her power so absolute, as within its blessed precincts, can never compensate for the lack of a carefully-guarded and well-trained childhood.

Fernald speaks to the point also on this subject: "In the growing—and, in the main, healthy—desire for independence felt by our girls, there is danger of shutting themselves out into the world where there are no homes. . . . We do not know of one woman

who is at the front of any good work, who was thrown out upon the world untrained and unguided in early life. . . . The really lovely and noble woman has her foot on the threshold of home. Even if much of her life be public and lonely, the corner-stone of her character has been laid in a cherished home of the past. If she keeps gentle, sweet, tender" (as did Joan of Arc) "amid the strain of conflict and the press of surrounding evil, you will pretty surely find there is some dear old mother or faithful daughter keeping the shelter of a lovely home for her, ... *somewhere* a woman's hand reaches out to her from *a distinctively womanly life*." The simplicity of Joan suggests an antidote for the prevailing extravagance, luxury and ostentation of our modern civilization. Her piety and fidelity, her humility and prudence, which brought her unscathed through the severest ordeals, forge the best armor and weapons for a woman's protection in any position she may occupy in private or public life. God has not unfrequently chosen a woman to perform some extraordinary task; He has never selected one who did not possess the virtues that prevented her from frustrating the work. Debbora, Judith, Esther were not only heroines, not simply patriots; they were women whose beauty of soul and spotless character rendered them fit instruments of God's designs, and in acting as such they escaped danger, because their impulse came from Him, and they followed it with no thought of personal renown nor with any desire for popularity or the praises of men. Many points of resemblance can be traced between these Jewish liberators of their country and the heroic Maid of Orleans, in character as well as in actions. Debbora, wise in council as well as brave in war; Judith, of whom it is said, "Chastity was joined to her virtue;" Esther, no less remarkable for the charm and candor of her soul than for her courage in risking her life in order to save her people. If the woman of the day would be as brave, as chivalrous, as admirable as these, she cannot disregard the lessons with which their histories are so fraught.

After all has been said about the modern woman, it seems that the most ambitious of the sex could scarcely expect to improve on the ideal depicted for us by a skilful artist of long ago. This woman was valiant, we are told. Her education must have been as many-sided as that of the present requirement; for, in addition to the long list of her distinctively feminine and domestic accomplishments, "she opened her mouth to wisdom," and must have, therefore, not neglected mental culture; "she hath strengthened her arm and hath put out her hand to strong things;" so, doubtless, she had not neglected physical training. Philanthropy had also its place; "She opened her hand to the needy, and stretched out her hands to the poor," and in the portentous question of

property and income she evidently had her "Rights," for "she made fine linen and sold it," "she considered a field and bought it;" and it is added, "give her of the fruits of her hands." After summing up this list of occupations and acquirements, we are quite ready to agree with the inspired writer, that "she hath not eaten her bread idle." What was the result? Her reward was in the loving blessing bestowed upon her by those for whom she labored in the family circle, though, incidentally, the repute of her domestic virtues—woman's greatest adornment—went abroad and brought her praise from others. Yet, strange to say, she appears to have had no political aspirations; it was the husband of the valiant woman, not she herself, who is honorable in the gates (it was probably he who spoke her praises there), when he sitteth among *the senators of the land.*

Joan of Arc on our altars will be an honor not only for France, not only for the Catholic world at large, but in a special manner for all women. In their craving for higher culture, for greater freedom, increased independence, in all their lawful aspirations, it will be well to retain whatever is tender and gracious in the old order of things and combine it with all that is strong and clever in the modern system. Then will the New Womanhood fulfill its promise, and be on the "sure way to the more perfect future of its hopes."

O fair Maid of Orleans! so sweet, so gentle, and yet so strong, we congratulate thee, and we rejoice in the honor bestowed upon thee by the Church, to which thou wast loyal in life and in death. God called thee to a unique mission; thou didst ever retain therein all the most beautiful and ennobling characteristics of thy sex. A woman, thou wast none the less heroic; a heroine, thou wast none the less all-womanly. Thy chivalrous deeds claim our admiration, but thy virtues command our homage and our love. O, thou who didst preserve to France her fairest provinces and her national existence, save us from forfeiting our softer graces and our true womanly individuality! In every phase of thy life thou wast true to thyself, devoted to thy religion, faithful to thy God! Thy example and thy exaltation should be as a light to our minds, a stimulus to our hearts, an added strength to our souls. O Venerable Servant of God, great Joan of Arc! we exult in the full measure of thy reward, and we hail thee the patron saint of the New Womanhood! ISABEL M. O'REILLY.

PETRARCH AND THE CARTHUSIANS.

GERARD PETRARCH, afterwards a Carthusian monk, the dearly loved younger brother of Francesco Petrarca (or Petrarch), accounted second in that great trio of Italian poets of the fourteenth century, Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio,—was born somewhere about 1308, at Ancise, a small estate, fourteen miles from Florence, the birthplace, also, a few years earlier, of his more illustrious, but less saintly brother.

Their mother had retired to this country house, when her husband, together with Dante, was banished from Florence by a faction in those troublous times. Their father would seem to have journeyed meanwhile, from place to place, seeking a maintenance, occasionally visiting his family in secret. At last, when he had lost all hope of being able to return to his native city, the elder Petrarch determined upon quitting Italy, and taking his wife and sons to Avignon, to which town in southern France, Pope Clement V., a Frenchman by birth, had removed the Holy See, to the great disadvantage of Rome, which suffered deplorably from the absence of its rightful ruler. The citizens of Avignon, on their part, complained loudly that the presence of the Papal Court had destroyed all simplicity of life and manners, introducing luxury and extravagance instead.

Disorders and difficulties of every kind were indeed inevitable in a provincial town invaded by a sudden influx of strangers. Crowds of Italians and other foreigners, discontented with their present fortunes and desirous of improving them, repaired to Avignon, causing a scarcity of accommodations and of provisions, and introducing many evils, and much expense into this hitherto peaceful place.

Italy, was at this period, rich, powerful, and enlightened, beyond all the other countries of Europe, and much in advance of them in scholarship, in literature, and in art. But, it was rent and distracted by civil discords, through the factions of the Guelphs and the Ghibelines. These arose, in part, from the contentions between the Popes and the Emperors of Germany, and partly, from the disputes between different cities and small states struggling for liberty.

The Petrarch family, after a tempestuous passage, at the end of which, they suffered shipwreck in sight of the port of Marseilles, arrived at Avignon in safety. This was in the year 1313. Eventually, however, they settled near the celebrated fountain at Vau-

cluse, a place subsequently inseparably connected with the memory of Petrarch.

Both Francis and Gerard, were sent to pursue their studies at the renowned University of Bologna, where the former made several valuable life-long friendships with some of the most distinguished of its professors and students. Amongst the latter may be mentioned James Colonna, afterwards Bishop of Lombes on the Garonne, who gave Petrarch a canonry in his cathedral. Through him, Petrarch obtained the protection of the powerful Colonna family, and in particular of the celebrated Cardinal of that name, in whose house the poet resided for a time, at Avignon. Both he and his brother, the bishop, were eminent for their virtues, learning, and patronage of men distinguished in letters, art or science. The name of Colonna is almost as much associated with the life story of Petrarch, as is that of his liege lady, Laura de Sade, whom he celebrated in song, and for whom his affection was fervent and intense. He emphatically denies that it was ever other than a perfectly pure friendship, and asserts moreover, that Laura, who was a woman of piety, morality, and extreme refinement, would never have permitted the expression of any wrong thought or feeling. "I take Heaven to witness," Petrarch writes: "that it is the soul of Laura, and not her person that I love. The older she grows, the more does my affection for her increase."

The life of Francis Petrarch cannot be said to have been morally stainless, but, though he yielded in his youth, under circumstances of great temptation, and in peculiarly dangerous surroundings, to sins, especially lamentable in one of his sacred calling, he subsequently expressed extreme contrition for these falls, and, later on, the general tenor, and certainly the ending of his life, were in harmony with these declarations.

Cardinal Colonna died in 1348, the same year as Laura. The Bishop of Lombes had expired a few years previously. Petrarch's brother Gerard was in a Carthusian monastery, so that though several close and intimate friends were left to him, amongst whom may be reckoned Boccaccio, whose acquaintance he made at Florence, in 1340, he survived or was separated from most of those who had been the chosen and best beloved companions of his earlier days.

We must return, however, to the morning of his career, and that of Gerard, from which we have somewhat digressed in glancing thus onwards to his later life.

The brothers were blessed with a most excellent mother, deservedly dear to them, and whom they lost, to their deep distress, in 1324, their father being already dead.

Petrarch speaks of her as follows: "She was a woman of rare merit, and although very handsome, and living where much corruption of manners took place, not only her virtue had never swerved, but even calumny had never touched her. She possessed a solid piety which she manifested in attending to the duties of her state and the care of her house."

There can be little doubt that her two remarkable sons, Francis, the scholar and poet, and Gerard, the holy and heroic monk, owed much to her instructions and her prayers. After her death, they found their affairs in much disorder, arising from the treachery of those to whom their father had confided them, and who had appropriated most of the property.

Both brothers, later on, took sacred orders, not so much, unfortunately, from a true sense of vocation as from hope of advancement.

The state of society at Avignon at that time was deeply dangerous for all young men, ecclesiastics as well as laymen. Francis and Gerard lived together on the most brotherly and affectionate terms, having similar tastes and common interests and projects. They frequented public places, and the state of their finances placed them under the disagreeable necessity of paying court to persons in favor. Often, a considerable part of the day was employed in arranging their toilet, and in the details and observances of the etiquette and requirements of society. Long afterwards, Petrarch wrote to his brother: "Do you recollect the time when we wore white habits, on which the least spot, or a plait ill-placed, would have been a subject of sorrow? when our shoes were so tight that we suffered martyrdom in them? and, when we walked in the streets, what care we took to avoid the puffs of wind that would have disordered our hair, and the splashes of water that would have tarnished the gloss of our clothes?"

Gerard Petrarch, however, was destined before long, and for many coming years, to wear a white habit of another fashion; to walk in warm, strong, shapeless shoes, with tonsured head and hood. Little did he dream of the life that lay before him, as, side by side, with his more famous brother, he paraded the streets of Avignon, so carefully and daintily attired.

In 1336, the two Petrarchs made an expedition to Mont Ventoux ("the Mount of the Winds"), from whence a more extensive view can be obtained than from any of the peaks of the Pyrenees or of the Alps. They had much difficulty in ascending the mountain. "While my brother," says Francis, "followed a very steep path, which appeared to lead to the top, I took another, which was more upon its declivity. 'Where are you going?' cried my brother with all his might. 'That is not the way; follow me!'

'Let me alone,' said I, 'I prefer the longest and the easiest.' This was an excuse for my weakness. I wandered for some time at the bottom. At last, shame took hold of me, and I rejoined my brother, who had sat down to wait for me. We marched, one before the other, for some time, but I became weary again, and sought an easier path; and at last, overwhelmed with shame and fatigue, I stopped again to take breath. Then, abandoning myself to reflection, I compared the state of my soul, which desires to gain heaven but walks not in the way to it, to that of my body, which had so much difficulty in attaining the top of Mont Ventoux, notwithstanding the curiosity which caused me to attempt it." Strangely symbolical seems the description of this ascent of the spiritual progress of each of the brothers.

Two or three years later, they made a pilgrimage together to St. Beaume, with other companions, also, not entirely congenial. "We passed," writes Petrarch, "three days and three nights in that sacred and horrible cavern." Gerard took this opportunity of visiting the Monastery of the Grande Chartreuse, which is only two leagues from St. Beaume. Already, as it would appear, he had begun to cherish a vague attraction towards the Carthusian life, which was greatly strengthened by this visit, although he did not beg for instant admission.

In 1342, a lady died at Avignon, for whom Gerard Petrarch entertained a great affection. "The object of your tender friendship," his brother Francis says to him in a letter, "has left us to enjoy celestial glory. I hope it, at least, and I believe it. The gentleness of her behavior, and the virtues of her life, will not fail to assure her felicity. Take back therefore, for it is high time, the two keys of thy heart. Thus relieved from anxiety, and thy path clear before thee, follow this beloved being, in the surest road. Nothing, now, ought to retard thy progress. Thou resemblest a pilgrim, who wants only a staff to take a long journey. You see, my dear brother, that we hasten fast towards death; when, in the awful passage our souls are released from mortal ties, they will take their flight with more freedom and ease." Gerard followed the advice of his brother, and determined to employ himself wholly for the future, in the great work of his salvation. He quitted the world, and went to the Grande Chartreuse, which he had visited in 1339. The heavenly life led by these monks in that awful solitude, had made an impression on him, which had never been effaced.

Petrarch thus relates the story of the foundation of the Carthusian Monastery of Montrieux, situated between Aix and Toulon, to which Gerard was afterwards sent and which became, later on, the scene of his wonderful charity and heroism, and also where

his last tranquil years were passed. "Two brothers from Genoa set out on a trading voyage; the one sailed towards the east, the other towards the west. After a number of years, one of them, arriving at Genoa, and being informed that his brother was at Marseilles, wrote to him to desire his return to Genoa, but receiving no answer he went to Marseilles, and finding his brother there, he asked him why he did not come to Genoa. This brother replied: 'I am weary of navigation and trade; I will no longer trust my life to the mercy of the winds; do you, as you please; my resolution is fixed. I have found a port on the borders of Paradise, where I will rest, and await in tranquillity, the moment of my death.'" The other, who did not comprehend this language, asked him to explain himself. He returned no answer, but took him to Montrieux, into a deep valley, in the middle of a wood, and pointed to a house he had just built there. Struck with the awfulness of the surrounding scenery, the other Genoese felt a sudden compunction, and determined to erect a second building, like that of his brother, on a neighhoring hill. They bade adieu to the world, and founded a Carthusian monastery with their wealth. This order is famous for its piety, and the austerity of its manners.

In the solitude the brothers had chosen, they consecrated the remainder of their days to God. It was in this Monastery of Montrieux, that Gerard, heroically tended his religious brethren during the fearful plague called "the black death," which ravaged all Europe, and particularly the south of France, at this epoch.

Although Petrarch loved his brother with tenderness, he was willing and anxious that he should become a Carthusian. Gerard, was naturally fond of pleasure, and of a wavering and unsteady will. He knew not how to moderate his inclinations, and this, gave Petrarch a great deal of trouble and uneasiness, especially in a city like Avignon. "I acknowledge," says Petrarch; "the hand of God in this conversion; none but Himself could work so great a change."

Petrarch had conceived a very high idea of the Carthusians. "This order, does not," he observes; "resemble others; none enter into it by force or seduction." Gerard was no sooner settled at the Grande Chartreuse than he wrote to his brother, to induce him to take the same resolution. Petrarch, his heart full of fervor and sorrow for past sins, hesitated for awhile, but could not make up his mind to comply with his brother's entreaty.

In 1347, Petrarch, who had not seen his brother since he had taken the habit, journeyed to the Grande Chartreuse where Dom Jean Birelle was Prior, and consequently, Father-General of the Order; a most remarkable man, who, on the death of Pope Clement VI. in 1352, was near being chosen for his successor, and

on hearing of whose death, Innocent VI. exclaimed in deep distress: "We have, then, lost the most eminent priest and monk in the whole world!"

Petrarch contracted a true friendship with this learned and holy man, with whom he continued to correspond. It was a great joy to Petrarch to see the brother, so dear to him, and who had been to him an object of so much anxiety, contented with the state he had embraced, and not regretting the world he had forsaken.

The Carthusians, who had heard Petrarch spoken of as the finest genius and the most eloquent man of his age, had ventured to hope that he would give them some discourses suited to their state. He staid only one day and night with them, but, at his departure, he promised them a treatise on the happiness of the monastic life and on the advantages of solitude, and he kept his word. The intention of this work was to compare the peace and harmony of their existence with the turbulent lives led by the people of the world. In a letter to Dom Birelle, he writes thus: "My desires are fulfilled; I have been in Paradise, and have seen the angels of heaven in the form of men. Happy family of Jesus Christ! How was I ravished in the contemplation of that sacred hermitage, that holy temple, which resounded with celestial psalmody! In the midst of these transports, in the pleasure of embracing the one so dear to me, whom I committed to your care, and in discoursing with him and with you, time ran so rapidly that I scarce perceived its passage. I never spent a shorter day or night. I came to seek one brother, and I found a hundred. You did not treat me as an ordinary guest. The activity and ardor with which you rendered me all sorts of services, the agreeable conversation I had with you in general, and in particular, made me fear lest I should interrupt the course of your pious exercises. I felt it was my duty to leave you, but it was with extreme pain that I deprived myself of listening to the holy lessons you deliver. I had proposed to make you a short discourse, but I was so absorbed that I could not find a moment to ponder it. In my solitude, I ruminate over that precious value which I gathered, like the bee, from the flowers of your holy retreat. I shall write to you the things I would fain have said. In thought, I am still with you."

Petrarch composed the promised treatise in 1347.

Gerard Petrarch made rapid progress in holiness from the time he became a Carthusian. Petrarch spent the winter of 1351 at Padua, passing much of his time with Ildebrandino Conti, the bishop of that city, a man of high rank and great merit. One day, as he was dining at his palace, two Carthusian monks arrived there, and were well received by the bishop, who loved the Order. He asked them what had brought them to Padua. "We are going,"

they replied, "to Treviso, by order of our General, to establish a monastery, the bishop and some of the pious inhabitants being desirous of having one of our Order." Conti, after several more questions, turned the conversation insensibly upon Father Gerard, Petrarch's brother, and asked them if he seemed contented with his lot. The two monks, who did not know Petrarch, related wonders of his brother, who had been now for a long time at Montrieux. "The plague," they said, "having invaded that monastery, the prior, a man of unexampled piety, but seized with terror, told the monks that flight was the only possibility. Gerard answered, with courage, 'Go where you please, as for me, I will remain in the place in which God has set me.' The prior redoubled his insistance, and to alarm him, said, 'When you are dead, there will be no one to bury you.' 'That is the least of my cares,' answered Gerard, 'and is rather the affair of my survivors than my own.' The prior fled to his own country, where death followed and struck him. Gerard remained in his monastery, where the plague spared him alone, after having slain in a few days thirty-four of his brethren who had continued with him. Gerard rendered them every service, received their last sighs, washed their bodies, and buried them himself, when death had removed those who should have fulfilled this office. With only a dog left him as a companion, he watched at night to guard the house, and took his repose in the day. The robbers, with whom this country was infested, came several times with intent to pillage the monastery, but he found some means of getting rid of them. When the summer was passed, he sent to a neighboring monastery to beg they would give him a monk to take care of the house, and he went himself to the Grande Chartreuse, where he was received with extreme satisfaction by eighty-three priors, gathered there for the general chapter, and obtained of them a great favor. They permitted him to choose a prior, and monks to renew his monastery, from the different 'Chartreuses' (or 'Charterhouses,' to use the old English appellation), having merited this confidence by his care, fidelity, and prudence. Upon this, he returned joyfully to Montrieux."

While the Carthusians were telling of the high, holy and heroic deeds of Gerard, the bishop cast his eyes, filled with tears, on Petrarch, from time to time. "I know not," says the latter, "whether my eyes appeared so, but my heart was deeply moved." The two Carthusians finally discovered him to be the brother of Gerard, and embraced him with much emotion; "Oh! how happy are you to have such a brother," they exclaimed. Petrarch could only answer with his tears; he was touched by this scene, beyond all expression, as he avows in a letter to his brother, from whence this extract is taken.

In 1353, Petrarch paid a visit to Gerard, at Montrieux. His presence rejoiced this holy house. Gerard was justly regarded as its second founder, and was become a most perfect religious, detached from everything upon earth, and longing only for the joys of Heaven. "I blushed," said Petrarch, "to behold a younger brother who was formerly my inferior, now risen so far above me. At the same time, what a subject of joy and glory it is, to have such a pious brother?"

After conversing about their old friends, and what had happened to them since their last interview, Gerard made known to his brother the troubles with which the Community of Montrieux was just then encompassed. These poor inoffensive monks were persecuted by some neighboring noblemen, who had made frequent attempts to pillage and destroy the monastery. "These petty tyrants," writes Petrarch, "are worse than great tyrants; the latter are commonly generous, and give with one hand what they take away with the other, but the former are famished harpies, who, the more they have, the more eager are they to devour." When the holy religious, before break of day, were singing the praises of God, a shepherd would come to them, in tears, to tell them that some of the flocks had been stolen, or that a drove of cattle belonging to the tyrants had ravaged vineyards, meadows and gardens; and when they had just begun to enjoy the short sleep their rule allowed, they would be awakened by the cries of a servant, or of the sacristan, attacked and beaten by the bandits. With difficulty they had saved their books and church ornaments from these robbers. Petrarch was much distressed at this sad state of things and wrote to make interest with the King and Queen of Naples for the protection of the monastery, the King of Naples being also Count of Provence. When he had to leave them, the Carthusians accompanied him on his way, and wept much at parting with him.

Gerard appears to have outlived his brother, who, in his will, desires his heir to write to him immediately after his decease, to give him the option of a hundred florins of gold, payable at once, or of ten florins every year.

In the summer of 1357 Petrarch retired to a village near the river Adda, three miles from Milan. "The situation," he says, "is charming, and the air very pure. It is on a little elevation, in the middle of a plain, surrounded on all sides by streams, not noisy like those of Vaucluse, but flowing quietly and evenly." John Visconti had chosen this delightful situation to build a Carthusian monastery. Petrarch intended at first to lodge in it as a guest, and the Carthusians consented, but, as he could not do without horses and attendants he feared that the noise, and above all, the drunkenness of the servants, would give trouble and distress in

this holy retreat. He therefore hired a house in the neighborhood, near enough to go there any hour of the day. He gave this house the name of "Linterno," and in joke sometimes called it "L'Inferno." "There is in my neighborhood," he writes to an old friend, "a monastery of Carthusians, newly founded, where I can enjoy at all hours of the day the pure and delightful pleasures of religion. The gates are always open to me, a privilege few people possess, but we should not wish to give trouble to others in seeking our own convenience, and this prevented my lodging there. I have nothing left to wish for but my old friends, and as you persist in refusing to visit me, I must draw all the consolation I can from my pious monks. Their conversation is neither very learned nor very witty, but it is innocent and holy. Their repasts are not inviting, but there is a perfect freedom in their company, and their prayers will be my great consolation, both in life and in death."

The summer of the next year also found Petrarch at Linterno, and continually in Carthusian company. The Prior of Milan having to go to the Grande Chartreuse to a General Chapter, took charge of a letter from Petrarch to his friend, John Birelle, the Father-General. This letter is dated "From the Monastery of the Carthusians at Milan, where I dwell," and runs as follows:

"Full of astonishment and admiration, I write to you as I would speak to Jesus Christ himself, who undoubtedly dwells in your heart, for the heart of the just, is it not the temple of God? They say you are an angel and that you lead the life an angel would lead if he were on earth. For my part, I behold you as a star rising from the monastery of the Carthusians to enlighten a sinful world. How happy are you! How miserable am I! While I am struggling with the tempestuous waves of time, in continual view of the death I dread, you are arrived safe in port, and, so to speak, entered into the porch of paradise with the hope, or rather the assurance of a blessed and endless existence." After entreating his prayers, he continues: "Sinner as I am, I see you in Jesus Christ, who sees us all and whom we behold in all things. I would however that my eyes could rejoice in the sight of you, and though I hear daily of your pious words, that my ears could enjoy them from your own mouth. . . . . I have confided a precious possession to your care, that only brother, enrolled in the army of Jesus Christ, under your protecting banners. Of all the gifts I have received from nature or fortune, none is so dear to me as he. I know that you love him as your son. You have taken him from me. I am consoled. I rejoice, nay, I glory, in a brother worthy to serve Jesus Christ in your holy family. The Prior of the Carthusians at Milan, who will present you with my letter, will confide my affectionate sentiments for you and your order."

John Birelle, in his answer to Petrarch, reprimands him severely for the praises he had given him, saying it was not right to praise any one to his face. He exhorts Petrarch to employ the great talents God had given him in works on morals and devotion, and in particular desired that he would write a treatise on the dignity of human nature, which Pope Innocent III. had promised to the world when he wrote his treatise on the misery of man. Petrarch, after justifying himself for the praises he had bestowed, by the examples of the greatest saints, Augustine, Jerome, etc., says: "I could make you the same reproaches with much better foundation. I neither claim nor merit the praises you have bestowed on my genius. You desire me to make good the promises of others, who have not time to fulfil my own. Perhaps, also, it was a subject too difficult for the great Pope, and what will it be for me? Innocent III. was one of the wisest men of his age, and did honor to the Holy See. He knew that human misery was a large, and human felicity a short and difficult subject. I am engaged in a treatise on the remedies of good and bad fortune, in which I try to suppress or extirpate, if possible, the passions of the soul. I was in the chapter on grief and misery when I received your letter. I apprehend that the malady of the soul called grief, can only be cured by the subject of joy with which we are furnished from the dignity of human nature. One would have imagined you knew what I was about when you wrote and that you meant your letter as a spur. It is certain that I am animated by it. The honor of your notice and the pleasure of obeying your commands will inspire me with courage; and if I cannot treat the subject in particular as you desire, you will accept it as considered more generally in the treatise I have mentioned."

This illustrious Father-General died very soon after receiving this letter, leaving the highest reputation for piety and good works.

Petrarch was a man of varied talents and wide interests, and a most voluminous writer in verse and in prose and on all sorts of subjects. He was a warm and faithful friend. It would be impossible in this little sketch of his intercourse with the Carthusians to make more than the briefest allusions, as has been already done, to one or two of the friendships which most influenced his life. Two strange and vivid dreams or visions, which came to him at the very hour of the death, at a distance, of two different persons, both very dear to him, may be read with interest.

James Colonna, the Bishop of Lombes, had made Petrarch a canon there. At the time of his death the latter was at Parma, and was purposing to go ere long to Lombes, in accordance with the wish of the bishop, to officiate in the cathedral. He had even some thoughts of settling near this valued friend, when he heard to his great grief that he was dangerously ill at Lombes. "One

night in my sleep," he relates, "I thought I saw the bishop walking alone and crossing the stream that watered my garden. I ran to him, and asked him a thousand questions at once. 'From whence come you?' 'Where are you going so fast?' 'Why are you alone?' The bishop replied with a smile, 'Do you recollect the summer you passed with me on the other side the Garonne? The climate and the manners of Gascony displeased you, and you found the storms of the Pyrenees insupportable. I think now, as you did. I am weary of it myself. I have bid adieu to this barbarous country, and am returning to Rome.' He had continued to walk on while he spoke these words, and had reached the end of the garden. I attempted to join him, and begged that I might at least be permitted the honor of accompanying him. The bishop gently put me back with his hand, and changing his countenance and the tone of his voice, 'No,' said he, 'you must not come with me at present.' After having said this, he looked steadfastly at me. And then it was that I saw on his face all the signs of death. The sudden shock of this sight caused me to cry aloud, and awaked me from my sleep. I marked the day, and related the circumstances to the friends I had in Parma, and wrote an account of it to my other friends in many different places. Five and twenty days after this I received the mournful news that the Bishop of Lombes was dead, and found that he died on the very day that I had seen him, in vision, in my garden." Three years afterwards the remains of this prelate were removed to Rome, to be interred there, a fact which increases the singularity of the occurrence.

The second of these extraordinary communications during sleep revealed to him the departure from this life of the beautiful Laura, who had for twenty years been the inspiration of his genius and the embodiment of his waking dreams.

"On the sixth of April," says a chronicler (1348), "Petrarch being at Verona, on his way to Rome, beheld Laura" (who was at Avignon where the plague was raging) "that morning in a dream, and they held a long conversation; the account of which, in his own words, is as follows: 'Dawn had dispersed that thick darkness which renders the visions of the night confused, and a blush of the softest crimson began to enlighten the east, when I saw a beautiful female advancing towards me. Her appearance was like that of the spring, and her head was crowned with oriental pearls. She had quitted a group of females crowned like herself, and as she drew near to me she sighed, and gave mé her hand. 'Do you recollect her who influenced your youth?' she asked, 'and led you out of the common road of life?' While she spoke these words she sat down under a laurel and a beech tree on the side of

the brook, and desired me to place myself by her, which I did. 'Not know you, my good angel,' I exclaimed; 'but tell me quickly, I beseech you, are you in life, or in death?' 'In life,' she replied. 'It is you who are in death, and in death you must remain till the time shall come when you quit this world.' On my expressing my grief at hearing that she was no more, she said: 'Petrarch! you will never be happy so long as you continue to be governed by the prejudices of the world. My death, which causes you affliction, would be a source of happiness to you, could you but know the smallest part of my bliss.' . . . . 'I was overwhelmed with sorrow,' continues Petrarch, 'and ready almost to sink under my distress, when I heard a low and mournful voice utter these words, 'This poor mortal is attached to the present life. Yet, he lives not, neither is he at peace within himself. He is devoted to the world. The world is the sole object of his thoughts, his words, and his writings.' I then recognized a well-known friend. She used to be sprightly and gay; now, she was grave and serious." Laura then resumed her conversation with Petrarch, assuring him of her undying regard, and explaining the necessity she had always realized, for his sake, and for her own, of a strict reserve and caution, during their earthly existence. Petrarch finally inquired if he should soon follow her, and as she was vanishing, she whispered, "If I am not mistaken you will yet remain a long time upon earth." Petrarch did, in fact, live twenty-six years after this incident.

The greatest anxiety, now, naturally seized upon Petrarch, and he waited with impatience for tidings from Avignon. Unfortunately for him, the plague had stopped all communication, and the couriers could not pass without the greatest difficulty. At length, however, on the 9th of May of the same year, Petrarch, then at Parma, received a letter telling him that Laura had died of the plague after three days' illness, on the 6th of April, at six o'clock in the morning, being the very day and hour on which she had appeared to him. Laura had made her will, with great calmness, directly she was taken ill, and received the last Sacraments, after which she remained lying on her bed serene and tranquil, entirely absorbed by the thought of God and of death, although surrounded by weeping friends, and thus gently passed away without a struggle. "Her road to heaven," exclaims Petrarch, "had not to be sought when death came; she had long known and walked in the paths that lead to it."

Petrarch all his life lamented the sojourn of the Popes at Avignon. "If I might but behold a Pope who would re-establish the Holy See and overthrow tyrants, I should be content to die the day after," was one of his utterances towards the end of his career. He saw the election and reign of several popes, but did not live

to witness the return to Rome of Gregory XI., which was mainly effected by the influence and representations of that marvellous woman and eminent saint, Catherine of Siena.

Petrarch rejoiced at the choice of Gregory as Supreme Pontiff, recognizing in him many virtues and having for him much respect.

Soon after Gregory became Pope, he wrote to Petrarch, whom he had long known and admired, expressing a desire to see him and to do him some service. In his reply to Cardinal Brunè, Petrarch says: "I will receive no benefice with the charge of souls, however great the revenue; the care of my own is sufficient for me. As to the rest, let the Holy Father do as he pleases, I shall be always his servant—useless, indeed, but faithful and submissive. If he bestow any benefice upon me, it will be a very short trust; for I feel myself as a shadow vanishing away. If it will enable me to expiate my sins, then the sooner the better. I pray God my purgatory may be completed in this life." These wise and worthy words were amongst the last written by Petrarch. He was found dead in his library on the 18th of July, 1374, with one arm leaning on a book. He was buried at Padua—in which cathedral, as well as in that of Parma, he held a canonry—in a chapel of the Blessed Virgin, built by himself. A. E. W.

THE SCRIPTURES IN EARLY CHRISTIAN ART.

THE leading maxims of Horace can never become obsolete or out of place, because they all chime in with nature. Hence, in treating of a department of Christian archæology—figured and pictorial art—we are reminded of the wisdom displayed by the Church in illustrating Biblical personages and events in a manner calculated to instruct those who could not read, and to edify even the learned; for all, while still under the dominion of the senses, must recognize the fidelity of these lines from "The Art of Poetry:"

> "Most true, whate'r's transmitted through the ear
> To mind and heart will never come so near
> As what is set before the eyes, and each
> Spectator sees brought full within his reach."[1]

Roscoe, in his "Life of Leo X.," well remarks that under the fostering care of the Catholic Church "the artist, whose labors were associated with the religion of his country, enjoyed a kind of sacred character," and lamenting the evil effect of the Reformation on the progress of the fine arts, he observes that the "exclusion of picturesque representations from the reformed churches is greatly to be regretted, not only as being an irreparable injury to the arts, but as depriving the people of a mode of instruction, not less calculated to interest their feelings and excite their piety than that which is conveyed by means of speech."[2]

In writing of Christian art we must bear in mind that its character was essentially hieratic in the earlier ages of Christianity. The celebrated Mozzoni (died March 21, 1861) in the first volume of his magnificent "Tavole Chronologiche Critiche della Istoria della Chiesa," published at Venice in 1856, says that "he would be greatly mistaken who should imagine that in those primitive times it was allowed to decorate the catacombs with subjects arbitrarily chosen. Every single representation was suggested by and executed under the supervision of the teaching church; hence, whatever was proper to be painted or insculpted was drawn from the precious fountain-head of the Old and New Testament."[3] The

[1] Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem,
Quam quae sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus, et quae
Ipse sibi tradit spectator.—*De Art. Poet.*, V., 180.
Translation by Sir Theodore Martin.

[2] Vol. ii., p. 241.

[3] *Eccellenza dell Archeologia Cristiana, e singolare sua autorità in materia Teologiche.*—Note 101, p. 29, secolo I.

Church dictated what should be painted and how, choosing the subject and regulating its mode of treatment; hence, the second Council of Nice (A.D. 786–787), held against the Iconoclasts, says: "The making of pictures is not the invention of the artist, but the approved legislation and tradition of the Church. This tradition does not belong to the artist, only the execution belongs to him; the arrangement and disposition is of the holy Fathers." The Anglican writer, Rev. Mr. St. John Tyrwhitt, calls this appropriately *Art Teaching of the Primitive Church.* How important it was to instruct the ignorant and excite the devotion of the faithful by proper religious images may be inferred from the words of Saint Gregory of Nyssa (A.D. 383) in his famous sermon pronounced at Constantinople, and entitled *Oratio de Deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti et de fide Abrahami*, in which, describing the sacrifice of Isaac, he says: "I have often seen the image of his suffering in a picture, and never passed the sight without tears, so vividly did the art of the painter bring the story before my eyes." And Pope Gregory the Great says: "Painting is used in churches, that they who are ignorant of letters may at least read on the walls by seeing there what they cannot read in books."[1] In the latter part of the fourth century Saint Ambrose decorated his basilica at Milan with twenty-one paintings representing Noah and the dove, Abraham entertaining angels, the sacrifice of Isaac, Joseph sold by his brethren, Jonah swallowed by the sea-monster, Daniel in the lions' cave, the Annunciation, Zacchaeus in the sycamore tree, and other Scripture subjects. Saint Paulinus, about the year 402, described several scenes from the Old Testament which he had caused to be painted in his cathedral at Nola.[2] The series embraced subjects from the Pentateuch, Joshua and Ruth, the creation of man, Abraham going out from Ur of the Chaldees, Angels received by Lot, the wife of Lot looking back, the sacrifice of Isaac, Jacob's dream, Joseph escaping from Potiphar's wife, the Passage of the Red Sea, the Crossing of the Jordan, Noemi and her daughters-in-law. The titles of the pictures were written over them. In the old basilica of Saint Felix, martyr, Paulinus decorated the walls with pictures from the New Testament. In another part of the same basilica there were depicted examples from Scriptures of male and female virtue in the histories of Job and Tobias, of Judith and Esther. In a descriptive poem the learned and holy bishop says: "Let us contemplate the sacred images and monuments of the ancients—And in three compartments we shall read the two Testaments—If we consider these things with right intelligence—we shall understand that the New

[1] *Ad Serenum episcopum Massiliensem*, lib. xi., epist. 13, ed. Migne.

[2] Poem xxvii., De. S. Fel. Nat. carm. 9.

Law is figured by the Old—As in the New we see the Old accomplished:

Miremur . . . . Sacras veterum monumenta figuras:
Et tribus in spatiis duo Testamenta legamus;
Hanc quoque cernentes rationem lumine recto
Quod nova in antiquis tectis, antiqua novis lex
Pingitur.

Venerable Bede, the historian of the Anglo-Saxon Church, tells us that in the year 674, the abbot Benedict Bishop brought from Rome for his monastery at Wearmouth, "Paintings of sacred images, to wit, of the Blessed Mary and of the Twelve Apostles, besides representations of Gospel history and of the Revelations of St. John in the Apocalypse, and placed them in his church of St. Peter, so that all who entered the church, even those ignorant of letters, whithersoever they turned their eyes, might contemplate the ever-lovely countenance of Christ and of His Saints, though in an image; or might more heedfully call to mind the grace of the Lord's Incarnation."

A few years later this pious monk—who wished all things in his church and monastery to be in the Roman style—*juxta morem Romanae institutionis*—went to Rome for the fifth time and brought back with him for St. Paul's at Jarrow, pictures carefully designed to show the relation of the Old to the New Testament: for example Isaac carrying the wood for his own immolation, and our Lord bearing the Cross on which He would die. Also the Serpent lifted up by Moses in the desert and the Son of Man exalted on the Cross; one picture being disposed above the other on the same wall.[1]

During the controversy with the Iconoclasts, St. John Damascene wrote his three Orations against those who rejected Holy Images, in one of which he says emphatically that pictures are the books of the unlearned. Verily wisdom is justified by her children, as said our Lord. We can do no more here than mention examples of early Christian art as illustrating the Scriptures and incidentally confirming the Canon of Holy Writ as it was held in Rome from Apostolical tradition and finally affirmed by the Council of Trent as necessary to be received by all the faithful. Some of the books of the Bible, it is well known, are called by theologians "deutero-canonical" because at some period doubts were entertained, outside Rome, concerning their genuineness and canonicity, others "proto-canonical," because no doubt about them was ever entertained anywhere in the Church. All now have the same and equal authority. How to prove the Canon of Scripture

[1] Bede: *Vita quinque sanctorum Abbatum*, lib. 1 et. Migne.

against those who reject some parts of it as apocryphal, belongs to a department of dogmatic theology: but an interesting amount of cumulative and confirmatory evidence—proving unalterable tradition against the innovators—can be found in early Christian art. Thus before adducing individual examples, we can bring forward the magnificent series of mosaic pictures with which Pope Sixtus III. in the year 432, decorated the tribune-arch and the side walls of the nave of St. Mary Major's at Rome. He selected different subjects of the Old and New Testament illustrating chiefly the lives of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, of Moses and Josue and such mysteries as the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Presentation of the Divine Infant in the Temple and the Adoration of the Magi. A singular historical importance attaches to these paintings because they were appealed to at the second Council of Nice (A.D. 787) as confirming the tradition concerning sacred images; and Pope Hadrian I. mentions them in detail in a letter addressed to Charlemagne. In the fifth century, also, Pope St. Leo the Great, ornamented the long lateral walls of St. Paul's basilica, at Rome, with a series of mosaics, beginning with Genesis and ending with the Apocalypse—going through all the books of both Testaments just as over a thousand years afterwards, they were explicitly announced by the Council of Trent as composing the Biblical Canon. We may remark here that on the old bronze doors of this same basilica which were saved, although in a damaged condition, from the great fire of 1823, and which were cast at Constantinople in the year 1070 and adorned with fifty-four scriptural compositions wrought in silver thread, are read the names of the prophets in Greek and short scriptural texts, now in Greek now in Latin, *BAPOYX*, Baruch, one of the deutero-canonicals, coming immediately after Jeremiah, although to this one is assigned a text —"Hic Deus noster et mon imputabitur alius," which is evidently an epitome of a passage from the younger prophet: *Hic est Deus noster et non aestimabitur alius adversus eum:* "This is our God: and there shall no other be accounted of in comparison of Him."[1] In some early catalogues of the canonical books, although agreeing with those the Church has declared such, there is sometimes a slight difference *in form*, in that Baruch is not explicitly mentioned, because his work was often included in that of Jeremiah, to whom he was secretary; and here we have a record of old Christian metal work to confirm the canon. The celebrated Monsignor Bianchini, in his notes to the Vatican edition of the "Vitae Romanorum Pontificum," by Anastasius the Librarian (1718–1723, four vols., fol.), has illustrated the relations of Christian archæol-

[1] iii., 36.

ogy to the canon of Scripture and other dogmas of our faith with an overflowing erudition which deserves special mention because he was the first scholar of his age to divine the full value of the study of monumental Christianity, of which Rome—subterranean and overground Rome—possesses such a precious, massive and splendid treasure; for as Prudentius sang:

> *Vix fama nota est, abditis*
> *Quam plena sanctis Roma sit,*
> *Quam dives urbanum solum*
> *Sacris sepulchris floreat.*
>
> PERISTEPHANON, "On the Crown of Martyrs," xi.

In treating of the Scriptures in early Christian art, it is well to remember that although the number of Biblical subjects that might have been chosen is immense, yet in fact only a limited number was selected, and the same subjects were constantly repeated. We account for this by saying that the principal or sole object of the ornamentation of the Catacombs, of lamps, of gilded glass and of early Basilicas was not merely to illustrate the fulfillment of Old Testament type and prophecy by the historical events of the New, but to convey doctrine.[1] These subjects are treated by the artist symbolically, and could only be understood by reference to "some hidden moral or devotional truth which they were known to signify." The principal Biblical paintings still remaining—some of them going back to a very early age, or of which we have minute descriptions from those who saw them—are the following: From the Old Testament: Adam and Eve after the Fall; Noah in the Ark; The Sacrifice of Isaac; Moses Removing his Sandals; Receiving the Law; Striking the Rock; Samson Carrying off the Gates of Gaza; David and Goliah; The Three Children Refusing to Adore the Royal Statue; The Same in the Fiery Furnace; Susanna and the Elders; The Taking up of Elias; Job on a Dung Hill; Tobias and the Fish; Jonas and the Great Fish; Daniel in the Lions' Den; from the New Testament, The Life and Ministrations of Our Lord, as given by Mozzoni in his third volume: Christ Infant—*Christus Infans;* Christ Teaching—*Christus Docens;* Christ Feeding—*Christus Pascens;* Christ Healing—*Christus Sanans;* Christ the Good Shepherd—*Cyclus Boni Pastoris.* Scenes from the Old and New Testament represented together or in studied juxtaposition were frequently shown in early ages. The sarcophagi, or stone coffins, used by wealthier Christians almost invariably represent some subject of the Old Testament in connection with one of the New of which it is a figure; thus, at one end we see the sacrifice of Isaac, at the other Christ

[1] Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma Sotterranea,* vol. ii., p. 43.

before Pilate; or at one corner Moses striking the rock, at the other Christ raising Lazarus to life.[1] The evident object of the teachers and pastors of the Church, in thus representing together corresponding scenes from the Old and New Testaments, was to insist that both Testaments had one and the same God for their Author, against certain early heretics, who taught two opposite principles—one of evil, the other of good, attributing the Old Testament to the former and the New to the latter. A beautiful bas-relief on the face or front of a grand sarcophagus from the cemetery of Saint Agnes, at Rome, combines the following scenes from the two Testaments: At one side—the noblest, the right, although it is the *left* of a person looking at it, our Blessed Lady, seated on a throne, holds her Divine Son on her knees to receive the gifts of the three Wise Men; on the other side Daniel stands, with hands uplifted in prayer, between two couchant lions looking up at him. Behind and on one side of Daniel is a figure, evidently the prophet Habacuc,[2] carrying a bowl of food. Other two figures in this double scene show that it was not an historical representation merely that was intended, but that a symbolical meaning must be attached to it. These two figures standing on either side of Daniel, Habacuc and the Lions, are noble looking men dressed in tunic and *pallium* and holding each a rolled up volume in the left hand, with this difference that he who stands at Daniel's left, has his right hand pressed against his breast and regards the persecuted prophet, whereas his companion figure has the right extended in the act of benediction, and regards intently the mysterious adoration of the Magi. These figures personify the two Testaments and bring the two scenes together that harmonize symbolically: Daniel, in deadly danger, miraculously fed: Jesus, in imminent danger from Herod, relieved in His wants by the kings of the East. On an old Christian lamp described by Bartoli, we see Jonas resting between two plants, two trees; one an ivy, a gourd or a *palma Christi* which bends down as if broken and falling to the ground, the other a straight, tall cypress tree. The gourd which of its nature is neither strong nor durable, and was less so than ever in this case by reason of the worm at its root,[3] represents the Old Testament, for as Saint Augustine says: "The promises of the Old Testament are like the protection of the gourd." *Umbraculum ergo cucurbitae super caput ejus promissiones erant Veteris Testamenti;*[4] whereas the cypress tree is strong and its wood does not decay and beside the reclining figure of the prophet, it is an emblem of

[1] Martigny: *Dictionnaire des Ant. Chrét.*, p. 723. [2] Dan. xiv., 33.
[3] Jon. iv., 7. [4] Ep. 102 *ad presb. Deo gratias, quaest*, 6 *de Jona. Proph.*

the New Testament which is an everlasting covenant. Sometimes also two olive trees are represented, one on either side of the Good Shepherd, or of the Blessed Virgin. Then they allude to the Hebrew and the Gentile Church or as Martigny prefers, to the two Testaments and quotes from Saint Proclus, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 434, who says in his second sermon on the Incarnation :[1] "The two olive trees are the two Testaments: and why does the prophet call them olive trees? Because as olive trees never lose their verdure, the two Testaments are the witnesses ever accordant of the Incarnate Word."[2]

It is also worthy of notice that in the old basilicas, it was almost invariably the custom to so dispose the paintings—fresco or mosaics—that Old Testament scenes, the law and the Prophet, should be depicted on the two side walls, whereas those from the New should occupy the connecting arch of the apse, as if to show that law and prophecy were bound together by the keystone of love in Him. *Qui fecit utraque unum.*[3] "Who hath made both one." This is especially noticeable in Saint Mary Major's, at Rome. We quite agree, therefore, with the Rev. Edmund Venables, although a Protestant, when he writes in Smith's "Dict. of Christ Ant.," vol. ii., p. 1457, "The manner in which the Old Testament was generally employed in early Christian art indicates a conviction of the identity of the revelation contained in it with the fuller one made in the New Testament. The cycle of subjects selected from it for pictorial representation, and the mode in which they were intermingled with subjects from the Gospels, may be regarded as a visible exemplification of Augustine's words[4] 'Novum Testamentum in vetere latet. Vetus Testamentum in novo patet.' . . . . The leading principle of early Christian art is the unity of the two covenants, and the interpretation of the Old Testament by the New, and the exhibition of the New as the fulfilment of the Old. This principle had its most complete development in the system of parallelism, by which type and antitype were placed in such immediate juxtaposition that the eye could embrace both at once and observe their correspondence."

Another interesting part of this study is how the Sacred Scriptures themselves and not any scenes taken from them are represented. The written scroll or volume of the ancients was in their figured monuments an ensign of distinction given to senators, orators and rhetoricians. The use of it passed from profane to sacred art, as an attribution of different classes of teachers in the

---

[1] *Fessler, Patrol.*, tom. ii., p. 581. [2] Zachariah, iv., 3. [3] Eph. ii., 14.

[4] The precise words of the Saint are: *Multum et solide significatur, ad Vetus Testamentum timorem potius pertinere, sicut ad Novum dilectionem : quanquam et in Vetere Novum lateat, et in Novo Vetus pateat.* (*Quaest. in Heptateuchum, lib.*, 2).

Church—Apostles, bishops, deacons and lectors, and as a symbol for the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament. It is not, however, always held in the hand. Moses appears with it when striking the rock. which may be taken as an artistic interpretation of the words of Deuteronomy xxi., 9, "Moses wrote this law," and as an expression of the orthodox belief about the authorship of the Pentateuch which the Pagan Celsus—against whom Origen wrote eight books—doubted in the second century. Our Lord is constantly represented with a volume in His left hand or a number of them rolled up and deposited in a basket at His feet, in paintings and sculpture showing Him as Teacher, because to Him it was given to open to His apostles and disciples the true sense of the law and the acccomplishment of the prophecies, as in Luke xxiv., 27, "And beginning from Moses, and all the prophets, He expounded to them, in all the Scriptures, the things that were concerning Him"; and because He often appealed to the books of the Old Testament in His disputes with the Scribes and Pharisees. In the subject of the Child Jesus in the midst of the doctors in the temple, from the cemetery of *San Callisto*, our Lord has a *scrinium*—an open case used by the ancients to contain documents to be easily referred to—filled with volumes beside His chair, which are clearly the Books of the Old Testament.[1] Two volumes tied together and lying at the feet of an *Orante* or young woman in the attitude of prayer, given by Bottari,[2] is a sign of orthodoxy, in that she admitted against the Manichees, both Testaments as equally from God; although Martigny thinks from the presence in the background of a Eucharistic vase, that it is intended to signify the assiduity of this holy virgin in reading the Sacred Scriptures as well as in nourishing herself with the Bread of Life. In a representation of the Adoration of the Magi, the Book of the Gospels is placed near them, in token of their being the first to disseminate among the Gentiles the glad tidings of the birth of the Redeemer and the accomplishment of Balaam's prophecy.[3] In another New Testament scene—the multiplication of the loaves, rolls of the four Gospels are introduced with reference, it is conjectured, to the answer given by our Lord, "Man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."[4] Buonarruoti[5] gives a representation of Saint Felicitas and her seven sons between two volumes of Scripture, as if to signify that for this revealed truth martyrs shed their blood. When a volume is placed

[1] Martigny, Art. *Scrinia.*

[2] *Sculture e Pitture sagre estratte dai cimiteri di Roma*, xix.

[3] Numbers xxiv., 17.

[4] Math. iv., 4.

[5] *Osservazioni sopra alcuni framenti . . . . trovati ne' cimiteri di Roma*, tav. xx.

in the hand of Saint Peter or Saint Paul, it signifies his own inspired writings: but when only one volume is put between the two chief apostles (who are almost always represented together in early Christian Art) it suggests their fraternal union and the sameness of the Gospel which they preached. Bishops as depositaries of the Word are represented in ancient monuments with a roll—*rotulæ*—or volume in the hand or beside them; but Saint Timothy is always represented with *two*—an allusion to the two epistles addressed to him by Saint Paul. Ancient mosaics often exhibit the apostles Peter and Paul with the volume unrolled and showing some extract from Scripture bearing upon their lives; thus in the apse of the ancient Vatican basilica (since destroyed to make way for the modern Saint Peter's) the Prince of the Apostles held a scroll in his hand on which was written *Tu es Christus, Filius Dei Vivi:* "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God"[1] and on Saint Paul's volume was read *Mihi vivere Christus est*—"For to me, to live is Christ,"[2] from his epistle to the Philippians.[3] It will thus appear how varied and how subtle is the significance of the volume as a symbol of the Scriptures.

In another article we may describe the manner—so absolutely different from that of the painters and sculptors of the Renaissance period—in which special Biblical scenes were represented in early Christian Art. These subjects, we repeat, were then treated by their authors primarily with a symbolical teaching in view and not as master-pieces of technical skill and artistic invention. A learned bishop of the Church in America has recently in a letter to us expressed the opinion that "Catholics write too little on the Holy Scriptures." In former ages Catholics not only wrote immensely, but they painted, chiselled and engraved laboriously on the Holy Scriptures. Let us hope, in the words of him with whom we began, that *Multa renascentur quæ jam cecidere:* and that texts of Holy Writ may become again to our people, "familiar in their mouths as household words."

ROBERT SETON.

---

[1] Math. xvi., 16. [2] I. 21.

[3] Ciampini, *De Sacris ædificiis a Constantino Magno constructis.* tav. xiii.

GIVE US A TERMINOLOGY.

AMONG the noticeable works on the philosophy of mind, published in the past few years, is the "Psychology" of the "Stonyhurst" series. The author, Michael Maher, S. J., may not have forecast the stimulating influence his book is apt to have upon the study of the matter which he treats. He has done very intelligent work in the line of unfolding the meaning of systems which have had some following since the rise of German Transcendentalism. We mention his book, here, solely for the purpose of making the statement that, in respect of the "system," it is peculiarly suggestive. One cannot read it and weigh its remarks upon the meaning of many writers, without being convinced of the importance—the lack and the need of a common English terminology for philosophical science,—a thing that would go far towards the harmonizing, correction and re-adjustment of theories.

If you put a Frenchman, an Englishman and a German (men of one language each), to dine together, and oblige them to ask one another for what they want, without pointing to the article—it is probable that, when the Frenchman asks for *pain*, the Englishman will say, there is no *pan* on the table. If he holds his glass to the German for just a *goutte*, the German will fill it to the brim, with hospitality, thinking that his companion regards the wine as *gut*. Let the German call for *kohl*, and the Englishman will stare at him. And if the Frenchman says *eau, eau*, the German and the Englishman will both be thoroughly disconcerted.

There is a way in which they might get along better at the next meal. Let them but agree upon names by which to designate the objects of their thoughts and appetites.

The scene at the dinner table is an exact counterpart of what is going on all the time at the table of philosophical science. Each "school" puts its own meaning upon words. The same word will be found to mean different things in different works on the same science.

Mr. Maher has not created a terminology. But he has given us summaries of systems in the terminology of those systems; and he has explained the terminology in such a way as to enable the reader to pass some judgment for himself. One effect of this very reasonable method is that it seems to be constantly inviting us to ask; "Why have we not a common terminology? Why

can we not all say the same thing in the same words? Why must we turn our English into five or six languages?"

A student who has studied what we call one "system," cannot understand a chapter of another "system," without going back to the beginning and following up the terminology so as to be posted upon the new meanings in which familiar words will have to be received. Men who have followed different systems can hardly converse with one another upon what may, indeed, be the favorite study of each, because they are constantly forced to ask each other for an explanation of terms. In the matter of psychology, above all, this divergence is found even in the meaning attached to the name of the science itself. Points absolutely omitted in the treatment by one "system," are deemed of primary importance in another system. The intimate relation between morphology, physiology, pathology, on the one hand as producing data, and on the other, psychology in the strict sense, has made the latter science an open ground for the students of the purely experimental group to thrust in their terminology beyond what should be a very severe dividing line.

The confusion is appalling. Rational philosophical science should not be allowed to be a science of impossible acquirement to an otherwise educated man, who might choose to read for himself. Of course, as systems stand, there must be a true and a false somewhere. When they differ in conclusions in such degree that what one affirms the other denies outright, there must be truth on one side and the absence of it on the other. But, in the present state of things, how is an educated man going to enter on a course of private study in philosophical science? He sees two books side by side on the shelf of the book store. They have exactly the same title, profess to treat of the same subject and, apparently, start side by side. But, at the end, they are in total opposition. Now all this may very readily come from the arbitrary modification of a definition. The definition gives the direction. The books advance according to the meanings they give to words, and their conclusions come out accordingly. The books advance as two large curves, which placed near to one another, seem for a distance, to run as parallel lines; but they are, nevertheless, diverging; and eventually, of the directions that seemed to be parallel, it is found that one is at right angles with the other.

Now, suppose that two men who wanted to study geometry, should step into a bookstore and purchase, the one a geometry written by Professor A., and the other a geometry written by Professor B. Now, suppose again, that they should meet, later on, when each one supposed himself master of the science of geometry. One begins to speak of the triangle, and mentions inci-

dentally that in a right triangle the square of the hypothenuse is equal to the sum of the squares of the other two sides. The second, at once, denies the assumption. The first stares at him; then undertakes to prove his assertion. In the course of the proof he remarks that the right angle is equal to ninety degrees. Number Two denies this. Number One insists. Number Two goes off for his book, and points in triumph to the page where the right angle is put down at ninety-one degrees. They start for the bookstore. One of the books must certainly be wrong. They take a book by Professor C. Professor C. lays it down that the right angle is *eighty-nine* degrees! If Number One and Number Two be strong-minded men, we may conjecture the expression of their sentiments relative to geometry.

This is what happens, every day, in the matter of philosophical science. Thus it is, that many, who, it would seem, should be able to find out something about it, become disgusted, and then the "crowd" holds up philosophy as a term of reproach, as the antithesis of common sense; whereas, it is just precisely, and ought always to be, common sense applied to the highest and most interesting questions.

The following passage from the third chapter of Mr. Maher's "Psychology," will show what he has had to struggle with: "The subject-matter which empirical psychology investigates is consciousness; but, as we have already remarked, the chief instrument by which our investigations are to be carried on is also consciousness. The question then at once arises: What meaning or meanings are we to attach to the term? The word has been employed in a variety of significations, but, for our purpose, it will be necessary to distinguish and recognize only three. In its widest sense, consciousness as opposed to unconsciousness denotes all modes of mental life. It comprises all cognitive, emotional and appetitive states which are capable of being apprehended. It is, in fact, synonymous with the sum total of our psychical existence. In its second sense, it signifies the mind's direct, intuitive, or immediate knowledge either of its own operations, or of something other than itself acting upon it. This usage, which is supported by Sir W. Hamilton, and some of those writers who maintain that we have, in certain acts, an immediate perception of a reality other than ourselves, makes consciousness equivalent to immediate or direct knowledge. Understood in this way, consciousness signifies the energy of the cognitive act, and not the emotional or volitional acts as cognized. On the other hand, it is opposed to mediate and to reflex knowledge. In its third meaning, the term is limited to that deliberately reflex operation by which the mind attends to its states, and recognizes them *as its own.* Conscious-

ness in this sense, is no longer that common constituent of all subjective phenomena, whether intellectual, emotional, or appetitive, which makes them mental realities; nor yet is it the simultaneous notice which the mind concomitantly possesses of such acts. It is a supplementary, introspective activity by which all our mental states are studied, and through its means what is implicitly apprehended in our direct consciousness is especially brought under review. In this signification the word is equivalent to *self-consciousness*, and whenever there is danger of ambiguity, or whenever it is important to bring out the distinction, we will employ the latter term with its adjective *self-conscious*. Consciousness in the first meaning, constitutes the object; in the third meaning, the chief instrument of empirical psychology."

Here is a case in point. Here, just as we have crossed the threshold, we are in a labyrinth made up of meanings attached to the most important term in the science of psychology. What rational objection could be urged against having the word, consciousness, fixed to a single, definite meaning? The recklessness of writers is disheartening. We plead for a court of appeal. Why this license in philosophy—a license which is permitted in no other department of letters, critical, scientific, or whatever it may be. It is said that the reading of the public is made up mainly of romance and the sensational journal. The fact is deplored. Much has been said on the subject. But no plan for amelioration has been suggested. We would humbly suggest a method by which the sensational novels now in print could be driven into the obscure society of the Egytian papyri. Reprint the novels and make them unintelligible. Grant to the novelist the right that has been conceded to the philosopher, the right of using words in any sense that may please him.

Were we to define psychology in terms intelligible to any educated person not professing to be a psychologist, we might call it *that science of the thinking subject which can be derived from the data furnished by self-consciousness.* Now, from the different mental states of which the thinking subject, man, is self-conscious, from the state of remembering, reasoning, etc., we must conclude that the thinking subject, man, who performs these acts of remembering, reasoning, etc., must be possessed of—for the sake of a word—of different "abilities." We should be inclined to say "powers" or "faculties." But, at this second step in psychology we are confronted by another difficulty. Says Mr. Maher, in a note on page 27:

"The exact meanings of the terms, faculty, power, capacity, function, and the like are not very accurately fixed in psychology. Power (*potentia*) may be conceived as either active or passive,

that is, as a special causality of the mind or as its susceptibility for a particular species of affections or changes. Hamilton, following Leibnitz, would confine the term faculty (*facultas, facilitas*) to the former meaning, capacity to the latter. The terms, act, operation, energy, on the contrary, denote the present exertion of a power. The last of the three, however, is also used in a kindred sense to the previons terms, as the perfection or special ground in the agent from whence the activity proceeds. The word function may signify either the *actual exercise* or the *specific character* of a power. *Faculty, power, and capacity* all properly signify *natural* abilities. Accordingly, G. H. Lewes inverts the original and universally accepted meaning when he would make the term *faculty* connote an acquired or artificially created aptitude."

Is a sincere reader worthy of any notice whatever when he asks, is there reason for all this? When it comes to pass that books are printed which *invert the original and universally accepted meaning of words*, what shall readers do? Is it beyond the possibilities of philosophical science to have one name for one thing? We must remember that synonyms are not identical in meaning. We can admit what we call synonyms into poetry, but we want them kept out of science. Science written in metaphors is, to say the least, distasteful. The rashness with which the terms *power, energy, function* have been employed has lined the shelves of the libraries with philosophical ruins. Observations of a parallel nature might be made upon the diversified use of the word *perception*.

If, then, writers will not agree upon what is meant by psychology, if they will not agree upon what they are to understand by *consciousness*, the primary instrument in their study; if there is no fixed meaning for those words that occur on every page, *faculty, power, function, action, perception*, what are readers to do? Perhaps, to deem themselves very obtuse. Or shall we wonder when we find even a sincere, energetic, and intelligent man sneering at the name philosophy?

All this considered, would it not be of great service to philosophical study if we had an "Academy" which would fix the meanings of words? True, not a little of the present disorder comes from the minor writers who must write books on subjects which they have not half studied; books that are seized upon by publishers as speculations, and which, thus, take their place in the vast array upon the shelves, adding yearly to the confusion and to the repellant reputation which philosophy has already acquired. But in the event of an "Academy," whose work would be to fix the meanings of words, these minor notes in the grand discord would soon be eliminated.

Much of the indefiniteness which afflicts philosophical terminology is due to the trenching of specialists on the domains of other specialists. A specialist in any department of biology, for instance, may not rightfully, as a biologist, invade the region of the psychologist. There exist lines of demarcation which should always be kept carefully in view. The biologist may refer to psychological conclusions that have been drawn, partly, from the data which he himself has furnished; but it is not his place to draw psychological conclusions inside of his own department, because these involve other data and principles foreign to his specialty. Still less should he try to formulate psychological conclusions in the terminology of his own particular study. To do this would be about the same thing as to speak of wines in terms that belong to dry goods, or to try to preach a sermon in the lingo of base ball.

The formal work of an "Academy" would be to fix the meanings of words—of terms. Beside this intent, discussion would be out of place. All discussion would be only as a means to the one end. An effort could be made to reduce the language of philosophy to the standard of the English language as the latter is found in the speech of the educated. Discussion to this purpose would do more towards bringing out the truth and error of theories (for they cannot be all true where there is so much contradiction), and more towards a readjustment than all the books that are being written. The multiplied and endless discussions of to-day produce very little fruit. The purpose of a discussion should be to arrive at the truth. The present methods of discussion only tend to mix matters up a little more in the minds of readers. At the very best, disputants meet at long intervals in the pages of a review; and they disagree, at the end, where they disagreed in the beginning. In long years of reading, I have not met with one case of agreement after discussion. Usually, in fact, the disputants do not come to an understanding of the statement of the question, because they are unwilling to agree upon the meaning of words.

The endeavor to fix the terminology would result ultimately in a determination, also, of the data for philosophical inquiry; and this would be one of the greatest boons that could be conferred upon the speculative science of to-day. An agreement would be come to regarding the *ascertained* facts out of which it would be *lawful* to draw conclusions that might be held as *certain*. We want a clear, distinct line drawn between hypothesis and fact. We want clear conclusions drawn with the rigor of logic from facts undeniable. And we want actually ascertained conclusions to be stated apart by themselves. It were a very debasing confession for philosophy to say that this can not be done. It is done in

every trade, enterprise and business where there is a dollar to be made. Tinners' unions, cabinetmakers' unions, railway corporations, publishing companies, mining companies, shoe companies—all build upon facts; and they go to the trouble of finding out the facts and of agreeing upon the facts. Why, then, in philosophy, where men make a business of using their reason, should it be necessary to be pre-eminently unreasonable? Why, in philosophy, which professes to be nothing but a search for truth, should there be an aversion to working upon incontrovertible data stamped with the seal of lawful experiment? If we want absolute conclusions, and we do want them, we can get them from such recognized data only. It is upon such data only, that it is lawful to build a positive science. And there is in philosophical science a positive side, just as positive as physics or geometry. If there were not such a positive side, then were the whole race of philosophers fit objects for the world's pity. We want that positive side divided off. The only way to divide it off, so that the reading public may pick up a philosophical book and read without dread lest their time is being spent over a vacuity, is that there be an agreement upon the surely ascertained facts as lawful foundations for scientific conclusions; and that there be an agreement upon the exact meanings of words. With these two things fixed, philosophy would soon become generally, what it is not now to most students—an education.

Hypothesis there must be. Hypothesis goes before demonstration. It is the making up of the mind to a *something*—as yet undetermined. But hypothesis is only the hound on the scent: demonstration is the bird in the bag. Because the hound has scented seven times, the huntsman may not go home with the conviction and the boast that he has seven partridges in his pouch. He has not a bird at all; and what the hound scented, may have been a bird of another feather.

There is a great work open here to those who may have the genius to accomplish it. The sole aim should be harmony in truth. Nothing should be pronounced upon, unless fully agreed to by those who would be regarded as competent to say the final word; and who would be originally, sufficiently divergent in their views to render general the acceptance of their unanimous decision. An over-tried class of intelligent readers would follow the movement with anxious, hopeful expectation. Of course, many points in many systems would, eventually, fare badly. But, in the midst of so much contradiction, it is worth while to know the truth. One who should be unwilling to drop a manifest error, could be regarded only as conceited or obstinate, or as both. And, by general agreement, such a one would soon be moulded into normal

shape or neglected. If one or another system of terminology should have to undergo a large revision, there would be merely one more barrier to knowledge removed: and mankind would be the better off. And if the new, universal terminology should show certain parts of certain systems to be unsound, illogical or only hypothetical, when reduced to the recognized terminology and data, then, too, many books would be reduced to their proper limits. Unsound parts, and hypotheses treated as demonstrations, could, in new editions, be bracketed: and the reader might breathe freely when taking up a work on philosophy.

Can the movement be begun?

WILLIAM POLAND, S. J.

(ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY.)

Scientific Chronicle.

MONEY, AND HOW TO MAKE IT.

"So geht's in der Welt:
Der Eine hat den Beutel,
Der Andere, das Gelt."
—GERMAN PROVERB.

So it goes in the world,
(And isn't it funny?)
The one has the wallet,
The other the money.
—TRANSLATION BY AN ARTIST.

Introductory.—A certain percentage of the inhabitants of this tight little earth seem to be somewhat interested in the pursuit of making money—perhaps even a pretty large percentage. The world usually talks in metaphors, at least when it isn't prevaricating. We do not intend to do either, just now; and so, when we use the term, "making money," we mean it, not in the metaphorical sense of "acquiring riches," but in a downright mechanical sense, without frills or figures of speech.

In a former article (this REVIEW, January, 1894), we stated that we were convinced of the unsoundness of the whole basis on which our present money-system rests. Hoping that the philosophical clouds will one day be cleared away, but seeing that the financial ones are still growing deeper and darker, we believe more strongly than ever in what we stated at that time. Yet, whichever side we take, whether we make the exchange-value of our medium depend on its intrinsic value, as we should not, or make it entirely independent of it, as we still blindly will not, the methods and processes followed in the actual making, or rather manufacturing, of money, must be a matter of considerable interest to many of our readers. Hence our excuse for the following outline-sketch of "Money, and How to Make it."

The Materials Used.—From a very early date, gold and silver, and, for the lesser values, copper and bronze, and even iron, were doubtless used as money. Still, long before these had been thought of, and also at times when they were not readily at hand, other substances, mineral, vegetable, or animal, easily took their place; and this remains true, to a limited extent at least, even to the present day.

For a permanent coinage, however, only metals will reasonably answer, and the first four named above are the only ones known to have been coined to any extent, until quite recently, when nickel has been added to the list. The bulk of the world's coinage has, however, always been in silver and gold.

Weighing, Weights, and Values.—Since, for any fair exchange, defi-

nite quantities had to be used, and since it was soon perceived that quantity was proportional to weight, it was natural to resort to weighing in order to determine quantities. In the twenty-third chapter of Genesis we learn that Abraham's wife, Sarah, died in the land of the stranger. For a burial-place, Abraham wished to buy a certain field on which he had cast his eye. The owner of the field, Ephron, kindly offered it as a gift, but the far-seeing patriarch preferred to hold it by a safer title. A price was therefore agreed upon, and "he (Abraham) weighed out the money that Ephron had asked in the hearing of the children of Heth, four hundred sicles of common current money" (probatæ monetæ publicæ.)[1] "And the field that before was Ephron's, wherein was the double cave, looking towards Mambre, both it and the cave, and all the trees thereof in all its limits round about, was made sure to Abraham, for a possession, in the sight of the children of Heth, and of all that went in at the gate of the city. And so Abraham buried Sarah, his wife, in a double cave of the field that looked towards Mambre, this is Hebron in the land of Chanaan. And the field was made sure to Abraham, and the cave that was in it, for a possession to bury in, by the children of Heth."

This business-transaction which took place about 4000 years ago, was conducted with admirable exactness. We have the description, clear and distinct, of the property, then the description repeated, then the agreement on a price, the actual transfer, the cash payment, and the presence of a large number of interested and disinterested witnesses, by all of which, the property was made *sure* to Abraham. The best real-estate agent of our own times could not do any better. He certainly could not make a "deed" more *sure*. Henry Georgites, please make a note of it. However, we are getting away from our money.

The silver used in the time of Abraham is supposed to have been beaten out thin enough to be readily cut into pieces of the required weight. Indeed, the *sicle* (*shakal*, *shekel*) did not mean a value, but a weight. It differed considerably from country to country, and from one age to another, varying all the way, according to different authorities, from 275 down to 208 grains of our Troy weight. So too, the *talent* was originally not a sum of money but a weight. It likewise was variable at first, but after many vicissitudes, it finally settled down to mean 3000 shekels. Some who pretend to know, estimate the shekel, for Abraham's time and country, at 232.6 grains. It is a wonderful comfort, relieving as it does the mind of all undue strain, to find some one who can talk down to *tenths of a grain*, in the case of the weights in vogue forty centuries agone. It tempts one to smile, and a moderate smile occasionally is good.

Anyhow, figuring on this basis, the price of Ephron's field was 193.83⅓ Troy ounces of silver, worth among us, at the highest price of silver during the fiscal year 1892–93, just $170.75; if calculated at the

[1] This expression would be rendered literally: "of approved public money," and probably referred to the *fineness* of the metal. The Protestant version makes it: "of money current with the merchant."

lowest price reached during the same time, it would be only $118.70½. This may seem to be a remarkably low price for "a field with a double cave, and all the trees thereof in all its limits round about." But land was plentiful in those days, and caves may not have been in much demand; besides, we know that the buying power of the precious metals was many times greater in those days than it is now.

Gold, as money, is mentioned quite frequently in the Bible, but for a long time, in all buying and selling, the gold, just as the silver, was actually weighed at each transfer. The shekel of gold should be worth to-day about $9.05, and the talent of gold $27,136. The word "shekel," in the course of time, therefore naturally came to mean a certain piece of money, but among the Jews, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Phœnicians, and others round about, the idea of its weight was never lost sight of.

Of the close connection between weight and money we have curious reminiscences in our own system of weights. Thus the old Saxon pound (weight), identical with the old apothecaries' weight of Germany, was equal to 5400 of our present grains, and this weight of silver became the English unit of value, the pound sterling (money). The abbreviation for this value is £, from the Latin word Libra, a pound, the stroke across the L merely indicating that it has been set apart as a sign for that sum of money, while the ordinary, vulgar pound (weight), was indicated by lb, two small letters, with a curl. Henry III., of England, in 1266, fixed the standards of weights as follows:

32 wheat grains (taken from the middle of the ear),	= 1 penny.
20 pence (we call them pennyweights now)	= 1 ounce.
12 ounces,	= 1 pound.

This would make the pound equal to 7680 of these grains, though the grain itself is said not to have been in use as a unit of weight. The conundrum which faces us here is: "Why wasn't it?" With the grain *in*, this system of weights would have been just as good as any yet adopted, but during the wars of Edward III. with France, his son, the Black Prince, brought over from the town of Troyes, about the year 1360, another system of weights, in which the grain did enter as a matter of every-day use, and of which it took 5760 to make the pound. This new system found much favor with the druggists and jewellers because of its convenience for small weighings, and because it could be split up in so many ways, being divisible by 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 24, 30, 32, 36, 40, 45, 48, 60, 64, 72, 80, 90, 96, 120, 128, 144, 160, 180, 192, 240, 288, 320, 360, 384, 480, 576, 640, 720, 960, 1152, 1440, 1920, 2880, *i.e.*, forty-six different factors. It was therefore adopted to the exclusion of Henry's system. It has come down to us under the name of Troy Weights, and is exclusively used in the Mint, and by jewellers, and by druggists in compounding medicines. It runs thus:

24 grains make	1 penny, or pennyweight.
20 pence, or pennyweights make	1 ounce.
12 ounces make	1 pound.

In passing from a system of weights to a system of money-values, it happened somehow, very curiously, that "pennyweights" and "ounces" got transposed, the result being that

12 (not 20) pence make . . . . . 1 shilling, and
20 (not 12) shillings make . . . . . 1 pound sterling.

The grain, as a unit of money, would of course be useless, and therefore never took root.

Marking and Stamping.—When the commerce of the world began to get somewhat extensive, this eternal weighing and re-weighing of the metal used for exchange, began to get very troublesome, and, necessity being the maternal parent of invention, it occurred to some bright, early specimen of the Yankee mind, to mark the weight, once for all, on each piece. At first, this may have been done by a mere scratch, but in a short time stamping was introduced. This was the first step towards the art of real coining. Later on, it was found convenient, and, in order to guard against fraud, perhaps even necessary, to make the pieces to a uniform size, or set of sizes. This was accomplished by hammering the metal to a given thickness, and then cutting it to a pattern (one which experience proved would give the correct weight), and then putting the proper stamp thereon. A rapid and easy method of exchange by *counting* thus took the place of the tedious method of *weighing*. The latter, however, was still often resorted to, especially in the case of very large sums, and also when it was deemed necessary to verify the correctness of the stamp itself as found on the coined piece. Our mints and banks of the present day keep up the same practice under similar circumstances.

Coining.—In what has been said above we find all the essential requisites for the coinage of money, viz., a metal recognized as suitable for a medium of exchange; a unit of value, depending on the previously accepted unit of weight; the stamp to give testimony to the weight, and thus obviate the need of repeated weighings. Yet, all this would still have left the whole system shaky and unreliable in practice, if the work of coining had been left in the hands of private individuals. Had this practice obtained, a double door would have been opened to various forms of fraud, and the temptation would have been very great. A little lower degree of fineness in the metal would not readily be detected, and a slight lack in the weight of each coin would easily pass unnoticed, while the aggregate fraud might be very great. For these, and perhaps at times for some other reasons, not quite so valid, the civil authorities of all countries soon took the power of coining money exclusively into their own hands, and have retained it ever since. On the whole, it is perhaps well that they have done so. Of course, governments can, and possibly do sometimes cheat, but we, the people, are not allowed to cheat the government, nor even one another. Again, it is well that it should be so.

It will be readily understood that improvements would, in the course

of time, be made in the art of coining. Among the first of these was the production, in greater or less relief, of designs on the faces of the coin. For this purpose, a die was engraved in *intaglio*, and fixed on a firm support. A lump of the precious metal of the proper weight, and roughly spherical in form, was laid on the die. A hand-punch was held against the metal which, by repeated blows of a heavy hammer, was forced into all the depressions of the die; hence we still say that coins are *struck*, although the hammer has long since been laid aside in coining. The coin produced by the hammer and smooth-faced punch, was "one-sided," specimens of which are still to be seen in numismatical collections and museums.

The next advance was to engrave the face of the punch itself, by the use of which coins having designs on both of their sides were produced. But even at that, it was very difficult, or rather impossible, to hold the punch true, and the result was more or less irregularity in the outline of the piece. We see the evidence of this in all the ancient coins, and even in most of those of a relatively late date.

The screw-press, worked now by man-power, now by horse-power, was not introduced till about the sixteenth century. It held the fort, even in civilized countries, for about three hundred years. It proved much more efficient than the hammer because of the steadiness of its action and because of the greater pressure which could be thus applied, and the perfection of a coin depends, in a great measure, on the pressure to which it has been subjected. It is clear that unless the pressure be sufficient, the metal will not enter into all the depressions of the die, and an imperfect impression will be the result. Otherwise, a setting-hen would answer the purpose. The screw-press was in use at the Philadelphia Mint until 1836, when it was replaced by the modern power-press; but of this more anon.

Date of First Coinage—Some More Units.—The Chinese claim to have had coined money 1200 years B. C., but we well know that Chinese statements in regard to dates in their history, and even in regard to facts themselves, must be received with much caution. When they claim the mariner's compass, and gunpowder, and printing, we may humor them; but when it comes to the steam-locomotive, the telegraph, and the telephone, we enter into the first phases of a *quasi*-doubt; but when it becomes a question of the origin of coinage, we respectfully withhold assent until some tangible proof be forthcoming.

As far as is positively known, the oldest coins in existence are those from Lydia, a small country of Asia Minor. These coins were struck in the seventh or eighth century before the Christian era, and follow the Jewish standard of silver. The principal river of Lydia, the Pactolus, washed down large quantities of a fine sand consisting mainly of an alloy of gold and silver in the proportion of 3 of the former to 1 of the latter. It was a source of immense riches, and from it, during 200 years, fabulous sums were coined. The earlier specimens are "one-sided," and of very rude workmanship and poor in design; but as time went on they were much improved. The last king of Lydia was

renowned for his wealth, so that "rich as Crœsus" has passed into a proverb.

The next claimant to "first" coinage is Ægina, but she is probably a little later than Lydia. Phidon, King of Argos, is said to have established a mint on the island (Ægina, now Egina), and this produced what was probably the first coined money of Greece. It was of silver, and was struck on a standard different from that of the Jews and Babylonians.

The prime unit was the *obole*, six of which made a *drachm*, and a drachm was equivalent to something between the one-half and the one-fourth of a shekel. Later on, when coining spread over the whole of Greece and Attica had taken the lead, the Attic drachm was made exactly equal to one-fourth of a shekel. The Greeks then stole the shekel and called it "*siglos*" or "*siklos*," whence the Romans, in turn, got "*siclus*," the French and English "*sicle*."

The Attic drachm has outlived the ages, and is now found in our Apothecaries' Weight, in which we have: "Eight drachms make one ounce." And it is the same drachm, for, as we have seen, at least implicitly:

1 shekel . . . . . = ½ ounce;
therefore, ¼ shekel (or 1 drachm) = (½ × ¼) = ⅛ ounce.

We have also inherited that other Æginetic unit, the obole. It is equal to 10 grains, but, praised be Allah, it did not get into our Table of Weights. But . . . . alas . . . . our gratulations are premature, for the pestiferous Romans did get in their "scruple," three of which make a drachm. So our table, revised, amended, improved, corrected, and enlarged, should read:

10 grains make	1 obole.
2 oboles make	1 scruple.
3 scruples make	1 drachm.
8 drachms make	1 ounce.
12 ounces make	1 pound.

The lexicons give us three forms: *obolus*, *obole*, and *obol*. The first is properly Latin, but is used in English; the second is real English; and the third is a phonetic fad. The original Greek is *obelos* (later, *obolos*), meaning a spike or spit.[1] It is believed that the original Greeks used iron and copper for money, and that long before silver was introduced or coining attempted, the iron or copper was hammered into the form of spikes, and that six of these spikes made a convenient "handful" for which their word was "*drachme*," our modern drachm. When silver and gold were made into coined money, the old words which had previously been applied to weights still held on.

Nothing in this world has a vitality like unto that of a "word." All else crumbles and dies, but a "word" lives on and on. The proverbial

[1] The diminutive of *obelos* is *obeliskos*, whence we get *obelisk*, as if an obelisk were a *little* spike.

nine-fold life of the cat, compared to the life of a word, is as the expiring sigh of a musquito to the metempsychosis of the Brahmans.

> "For men may come, and men may go;
> But *words* go on forever."—(*pace* TENNYSON.)

During the next few hundred years, after the Æginians had started the business, the art of coining was developed in Greece to a point of perfection that has never since been surpassed. The beauty of her coins kept pace with the beauty of her painting, her sculpture, and her architecture, and when we have said this we have said all. Coining had been invented merely as a commercial convenience, but the Greek was a born artist, and left the imprint of his art on everything he happened to handle; and so Greece threw into her coins all her mythology and all the history of her early struggles, her defeats, her victories, and her downfall, and, after her first crude endeavors were over, she did it artistically and gloriously.

Coining by Casting.—This heading has no reason for its existence, except perhaps, a negative one, for it does not seem that any serious attempts were ever made to coin money by melting the metal and casting it into moulds. The reasons for this may be, first, that, in the early days, hammering and stamping would be found to be much the simpler method; secondly, when exactness as to weight became paramount, as must soon have been the case, casting would be very unreliable; thirdly, in casting, the metal would be less hard and dense, and its texture would be less even, than when fashioned by being subjected to strong pressure; fourthly, gold and silver shrink in cooling from the molten condition, and consequently will not take a good impression from the mould; lastly, the lustre would be far inferior, since this is due principally to pressure. Yet, not so very long ago, nearly everybody imagined, and even now many people still imagine, that coins are made by melting and casting.

Apropos, of making money by casting; a good story is told of the great Daniel O'Connell. It was well known to the people of a generation or two ago, but lest it should be lost and forgotten, we embalm it in the enduring pages of the QUARTERLY. If you know it already, why skip to the next paragraph, and save that much time.

Well, once upon a time, for one reason or another, an idea got abroad that the Bank of Dublin was going under, and a "run" on the bank was begun. Now, a run is always more or less dangerous, in the case of even the best regulated banks, and other things. The officers met the difficulty bravely, however, and began to pay out their gold rapidly, in hopes of regaining the confidence of the depositors. But it did not avail, and things began to look blue. The case is somewhat like this: A 150-pound man might carry a load of 25 pounds to the top of the Washington monument (500 feet high); he would be more than likely to fail were he to attempt to carry 100 pounds up to the first landing-place (50 feet high). And yet the work to be done in the former case is just

seven times as great as in the latter. The reason for his failing in the second case is because he is called upon to do *too much at once.* If he could spread it out enough, he could carry the world. Just so it happens with banks. Matters, we said, were looking blue; but just at the right moment one of the officers had an inspiration. He thought that if O'Connell would only come and speak to the crowd they might be persuaded to retire. O'Connell came, but with an inspiration of his own. He entered the directors' room by a private door, and without any explanation, called for a fire-shovel and a handful of gold pieces. He heated the gold till it was altogether too hot for comfortable handling, and sent it out just so to be paid over the counter. Then a new batch was treated in the same way; and for some minutes there was plenty of fun in the front ranks of the fun-loving crowd, for an Irishman loves fun even in the most unfavorable circumstances. But the leaven was working, so that soon, some one who had just *got his own money safe*, and was tossing it from one hand to the other to keep it warm, cried out, "Arrah, boys, what's the use? Sure, don't we *see them* coining the goold, as fast as they can, *before our eyes?*" "True for you," says another; and, "Bedad, you're right," puts in a third; and with that the true Irish humor came to the top, and a shout went up, "Long live the Bank of Dublin," and the run was over. It was not the fire-shovel, nor the hot gold pieces, that did the work; it was the grand head of brains behind them.

Coining, having once got a good start, rapidly passed to all the nations of the world. It has endured till now, and will doubtless still endure through all the ages of man's time on earth.

Our Own Coinage.—Truth to tell, dear reader, we are getting a little homesick, and feel that it is time to return and take a look at the coinage of our own country.

Prehistoric.—By "prehistoric" we do not mean that we intend to sail back to the times before history began, but only to the days when the United States, *as such*, did not yet exist, and consequently before it could have a history.

The early explorers who followed in the wake of Columbus, though quite ready to pick up any stray lump of gold or silver, not known to belong to anybody else, did not waste their energies in attempts at coining. Provided they could put their hands on the *substance*, they cared little for the *form*, for they knew that they could exchange their nuggets of precious metal for coined money whenever they wished. Besides, their roving life would effectually hinder them from establishing a plant, however desirable it might have been to do so. But when those who came had settled down into what were intended to be permanent habitations, and had begun to embark in real commercial pursuits, they must have felt the need of regularly coined money. The parent country supplied them to some extent, but the supply was precarious.

The first real settlement was made at St. Augustine, Florida, in 1565, but we hear of no coining having been done at that place. Probably, the settlers were not sufficiently numerous to justify such an attempt, or

perhaps they found that the coins of Old Spain, when they could get them, were good enough for all their simple wants.

Virginia was colonized in 1607, and five years later, the Virginia Company started the coining business of America. They located their plant on Somers Islands (now called the Bermudas). This place may have been chosen for the sake of putting a respectable distance between their works and the Indians, who took quite an interest in the practical side of numismatics. They could not have cared much about the lucre, as such, for the coins were nothing but brass.

The "legend" of the coin was, "Somers Island," with a "hogge on one side, in memory of the abundance of hogges which were found on their first landing." On the reverse was a ship under full sail, with a flag flying, and firing a gun. But this coin must have soon fallen into disuse, for, in 1645, the Assembly of Virginia met and declared that it had "maturely weighed and considered how advantageous a quoine current would be to this collony, and the great wants and miseries which do daily happen unto it by the sole dependency upon tobacco and pelts." They therefore provided by law for the coinage of copper pieces of the value of 2, 3, 6 and 9 pence; but the law, like many other laws, re-remained a dead-letter, and none of these coins were ever struck.

The authorities of the Massachusetts Bay Colony were the next to try their hand at coining. On May 12, 1652, the General Court of Massachusetts passed an order establishing "a mint howse" at Boston. The coinage was to be of "12 pence, 6 pence, and 3 pence pieces, which shall be of forme flatte, and stamped on the one side with N. E., and on the other side with XII*d.*, VI*d.*, and III*d.*, according to the value of each peece." These coins were to be of the fineness of "new sterling English money" (silver), and every shilling was "to weigh threepenny troy weight, and lesser peeces proportionably."

This law went into effect, and in an incredibly short space of time, the coins were a lining to the pockets and a joy to the hearts of the New Englanders. It will have been noticed, from the description just given, that the "peeces" were severely plain, more so perhaps than their Puritan bonnets; and this plainness exposed them to "washing and clipping," by which processes the coins were dishonestly relieved of a part of their weight, and this without attracting much notice. Alas—and we had always been taught to believe that the Puritan was a being without guile. But the General Court proved itself equal to the occasion, for on October 19th of the very same year, it ordered a new die to be made, and required that "henceforth both shillings and smaller peeces shall have a double ring on either side, with this inscription, 'Massachusetts,' and a tree in the centre on the one side, and 'New England' and the date of the year on the other side." In 1662 a twopenny piece was added to the series. This is called the "pine tree" money. It was coined by John Hall, silversmith, of Boston, who made a good speculation of the job, so that, on the marriage of his daughter, he was able to present her with a dowry equal to her own weight in "pine-tree shillings."

Coinage was, of course, a royal prerogative, and the profligate

monarch, Charles II., who could spend money much faster than he could raise it, was exceedingly wroth at the Massachusetts Bay Company, and revoked their charter. But a good friend of the colonies, Sir Thomas Temple, fooled the king by presenting him with one of the obnoxious coins and *explaining* that the "tree" on the coin was the "royal oak" which had saved his majesty's life. The king's vanity was thus sufficiently flattered for the moment, and laughingly calling the Americans "honest dogs," he allowed the coinage to go on. This mint was in existence about thirty-four years, but it is probable that the dies were never renewed, for all the coins known to exist now, bear the date of 1652 or 1662.

In this latter year Maryland made an attempt "for the getting up of a Mint within the province," but the project failed, and the colony was supplied with shillings, sixpences, and fourpences, struck in England. They were of silver, but of totally different designs from the ordinary English coins, bearing, instead of the royal head and "fixings," the bust and coat-of-arms of Lord Baltimore.

Exactly one hundred years later New Hampshire legislated for a copper coinage, but this too ended in abortion.

George I., whose reign was short (1714–27), undertook to introduce into general circulation in all the colonies, coins made of Bath metal, or pinchbeck, having on the reverse a large double-rose, with the legend "Rosa Americana," and on the scroll "Utile Dulci," which being interpreted mean "The American Rose," and "The Useful with the Agreeable." The scroll was well enough, but the legend was a sop. The introduction of these coins was stoutly resisted. They were made by one William Wood, under a royal patent "for coining small money for the English plantation in pursuance of which he had the conscience to make 13 shillings out of a pound of brass." The attempt to foist this same "Wood's Money" on Ireland was the cause of a great deal of excitement, and brought down upon it the lampoons of Dean Swift.

During the War of Independence, and for some time after its close, the power of coinage was exercised not only by the Confederation in Congress, but also by the individual States. Vermont, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York and New Jersey, had each one or more mints, and the variety of coins which they put forth is a wonder to behold. It is interesting too to note the bubbling up and boiling over of patriotism and glorification on the coins struck shortly after the terrible struggle was ended. Liberty caps, liberty poles, goddesses of liberty, stars, sunbursts, eagles, shields, olive wreaths, Indians, arrows, figures of Justice with the scales, the magic number THIRTEEN, etc., are found lying around profusely and in all sorts of combinations.

The superscriptions are, of course, in keeping with the rest of the designs. Here are a few specimens:

NOVA CONSTELLATIO (A New Constellation); LIBERTAS JUSTITIA (Freedom is Justice); IMMUNIS COLUMBIA (Columbia Free); FUGIO (whatever that was meant for); E PLURIBUS UNUM (One from Many); INIMICA TYRANNIS AMERICA (America the

Foe of Tyrants); LIBER NATUS LIBERTATEM DEFENDO (Born Free I Defend Freedom); and, in plain English, "We are One"; "Independence and Liberty"; "AN ASYLUM FOR ALL NATIONS," etc.

All these things lift the veil, and reveal to us, in no uncertain light, the temper of those times; they tell us how felt the men who had passed through the fiery ordeal in safety, who had broken their bonds, and who now at last were free. We may surely pardon them a little spread-eagleism; and not think them too bold when they sang:

> "God bless the fairest, noblest land
> That lies beneath the sun;
> Our country, our whole country, and
> Our country ever one."

Historic Times in the United States.—In January, 1782, while the colonies were still engaged in their desperate struggle, Robert Morris, the financier of the Revolution, submitted to the Continental Congress a plan for the establishment of a regular mint. In the course of a month the plan was duly approved, but on account of the difficulties of the times, the matter rested there, and nothing further was done until some time after peace was declared. In 1785, the Congress of the new-born nation took up the question of a *national* coinage. Under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson the matter was pushed during the following year to a conclusion, as far, at least, as the kinds and character of the proposed coins were concerned.

"Previous to the passage of the law by the Federal government for regulating the coins of the United States, much perplexity arose from the use of no less than four different currencies or rates, at which one species of coin was recoined in the different parts of the Union. Thus, in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Vermont, Virginia and Kentucky, the dollar was recoined at six shillings; in New York and North Carolina at eight shillings; in New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Maryland at seven shillings and sixpence; in Georgia and South Carolina at four shillings and eightpence." (Evans).

The law of 1786 swept away all this, as well as the whole English system of pounds, shillings and pence, and in its place substituted the vastly simpler arrangement, based on the decimal system of numbers, which we still retain. The law provided for the coinage of eagles, dollars, dimes, cents and mills, and also of pieces having the half value of each of these. The size, weight, value, figures and lettering were all decided upon. This was all very well on paper, but there is something in man which no human legislation can completely control; a sort of an instinctive tendency to reach his ends by the easiest routes. Hence it happens that we never count in eagles, and in dimes, hardly ever, while the mill, as a coin, has remained a fiction; but a short time afterwards it was found necessary to add the double-eagle, the quarter-eagle, and the quarter-dollar to the coins already provided for. The coinage of three-dollar gold pieces was begun in 1853 but discontinued in 1889,

and of twenty-cent silver pieces, in 1875. The latter venture lasted four years, and that was just four years too long. In 1787 the supreme power of the United States government was concentrated on the business, and a few tons of copper were coined into cents at the old colonial mint in New Haven, but the government had as yet no mint of its own. Legislation, however, still went on, until at last, on April 2, 1792, a law was passed which was destined to really go into effect.

The Old Mint.—In pursuance of the provisions of this law, a lot of ground was purchased on Seventh Street, near Arch, Philadelphia, and on this spot the corner-stone of the first United States Mint was laid, July 31, 1792. This was the first building for public use erected under the authority of the United States Government. An old still-house which had occupied the lot was removed, and from the sale of some of the old materials, on this memorable July 31st, a sum of seven shillings and sixpence was realized, "which," Mr. Rittenhouse directed, "*should be laid out for punch in laying the foundation-stone.*"

It was a plain three story brick building, not unlike, in outward appearance, the ordinary Philadelphia dwelling-house. After having served its purpose for about forty years, it was found too small for the increased demands made on it, and a new site had to be selected, as we shall see below.

The first issue of coins from the mint was in October, 1792. To erect a building suitable for a coining establishment; to get together the necessary plant and set it up, and produce coined money in less than three months, all without the aid of steam-power or the convenience of railroads, was pretty quick work. The first coins sent out consisted of half-dimes made from old colonial money melted down. The first purchase of metal for coinage was not a heavy transaction. It consisted of six pounds of old copper, at one shilling and sixpence per pound, which was immediately turned into cents and half-cents, bearing the date 1793; but the issue did not probably flood the market. In July, 1794, just one hundred years ago, the Bank of Maryland made the first deposit of silver. It consisted of "coins of France" amounting to $80,715.73½ and this appeared as dollars, half-dollars and half-dimes, in the following October.

The first deposit of gold was made by Moses Brown, of Boston, in February, 1795, and was valued at $2276.72. The mint never makes payments in anything but its own coins, and of the same kind as the metal of the deposit; but as it had not yet coined any gold, this payment was necessarily made in silver. This first deposit of gold came forth from the mint as half-eagles, in July of the same year.

The amount of money coined at what we would now call the "old mint" is stated in round numbers as follows:

From 1792 to 1800,	$2,534,000
1800 to 1810,	6,971,000
1810 to 1820,	9,328,000
1820 to 1830,	18,000,000
Total,	$36,833,000

This is not bad, considering that the coinage of most nations for the first forty years of their life was o, or some combination of o's.

The New Mint.—The old mint continued to flourish and grow apace, so that during the first thirty-seven years of its existence the business increased beyond the capacity of the buildings and accommodations, and "not only were our vaults full, but our entries and corridors were at times crowded with rows of kegs." It became necessary, therefore, to seek a new location, and on March 2, 1829, Congress appropriated the sum of $120,000 for the erection of a new mint.[1] A lot measuring 150 feet on Chestnut Street, and running back on Juniper Street 204 feet to Penn Square, was secured. This was then, and in some respects remains, one of the finest locations in the town. The corner-stone of the new building was laid on July 4, 1829, but this time the foundations were laid without any punch, at least officially. The building practically covers the whole of the lot. It is of the Grecian style of architecture, with a portico on the Chestnut Street front, and a similar one on Penn Square, of 60 feet, and containing each six Ionic columns. The whole is of white marble, and the roof is appropriately covered with copper. The building was completed and everything set in apple-pie order, so that coining was begun in 1833. Since then certain alterations have been made in the interior arrangements, and the building was made fire-proof in 1856, but the outward aspect has not been changed.

In case any of our friends should contemplate embarking in the mint business, they would perhaps be pleased to learn that the cost of the whole concern, including ground, buildings, fences, furniture, pavement, plant for all the operations comprised under the general term "coining," as weighing, assaying, melting, refining, rolling, cutting, coining proper, counting, and for the introduction of steam-power, and improved apparatus and machinery in all the departments, since 1829, has been about $250,000, which we think will be looked upon as a very moderate sum.

During the sixty years from 1833 to 1893, the total output of the Philadelphia mint is reckoned at $1,044,214,664.12, of which about 64 per cent. was in gold, 34 per cent. in silver, and the remaining 2 per cent. in copper, nickel and bronze. This makes an average of nearly 17½ millions a year, but the annual figures fluctuated wildly. The minimum was reached in the year 1841, when the output went down to less than 1⅓ millions; on account of the discovery of gold in California (1848) the coinage of 1851 and 1852 rose to a very high figure; for the former of these years it was $52,689,878.43, and for the latter, $52,403,679.44. By the end of the next eight years it had declined to less than 3 millions, and then, in 1861, it made a bound to nearly 71 millions; while during the next four years, *i.e.*, during the Civil War, it did not average 6 millions a year. Then for eighteen years we lived like goats, mostly on paper, of which a large proportion, especially of the smaller pieces, was not merely very dirty externally, but at the same time intrin-

[1] The old building, we believe, still remains at Nos. 37 and 39 N. Seventh Street; at least it was there when we last saw it.

sically very bad. We were young, however, then, and had good digestive powers, and so we managed to worry through until the resumption of specie payments, in 1879, which event sent the coinage up to its maximum, in 1881, in which year the mint at Philadelphia turned out $76,977,125.50. Since then it has gone down a great deal, and at times up a little, the last year of which we have a full account (1892), giving us a little over 18 millions.

Other Mints of the United States.—Any one who knows the American character will easily understand that we would never be content with a single mint; and so it has turned out that the Philadelphia mint has been the happy mother of five children, all girls. In 1838, at the youthful age of 46, she gave birth to the triplets, "Dahlonega, Ga.," "Charlotte, N. C.," and "New Orleans." The first and second sickened from an outbreak of "civil war," and died, aged 23 years, their united efforts up to that date having supplied the country with coins to the value of $11,165,757. The third sickened with the same contagion, but after a prostration of 18 years, rallied, and is now as well as ever again. She has a record for the 37 active years of her life of $189,335,167.60. The next child was born in 1854, and was christened "San Francisco." She proved to be an exceedingly healthy and robust child, and bids fair to rival, if not surpass, her mother. In fact, in the last twenty years, she has been behind her mother only eight times, and ahead of her twelve times. Her total contributions to American numismatics, in forty years, has been $975,875,893.55, an average of nearly 24½ millions per year, or 1⅔ times the average output of Philadelphia during 60 years. The last poor little thing was named "Carson." She was born in 1870, and died, probably of consumption, at the early age of 23, having done work while yet amongst us to the value of $49,274,434.40. The total coinage of all our mints during the year from January 1, 1892, to January 1, 1893, was $48,389,780.92.

An one who will take the pains to pick out and add up the proper amounts, from the figures given above, will find (errors, if any, excepted), that there has been coined in the United States between April 2, 1792, and July 1, 1893 (101 years), the neat little sum of $2,307,865,896.57. Over two billions! Well, what of it? Why, just think of what a nice time you would have in counting it (on the supposition that you owned it all). Following our old plan, of counting one dollar per second, for ten hours per day, and neglecting the 57 cents, it would take a little over 175½ years to get through the mere count, and there would be very little time left to enjoy the *thing*. So?

The coins which made up this sum ranged in value all the way from one half-cent up to the double eagle of twenty dollars; but, very unexpectedly we find that the number of pieces exceeded the number of dollars by nearly 25 per cent.—the number of pieces being 2,881,579,622.

Making Money in Modern Times.—But this prolonged contemplation of $'s and ¢'s, which do not belong to us, however soporific it may be, is not calculated to calm the nerves, and we shall abandon it for something less exciting.

We have seen, in a scrappy way, how money was coined in days of yore. Let us now take a look at the operations of a full-blown mint plant, and our mother-mint at Philadelphia will serve as an excellent example.

Departments, Apparatus, and Operations.

Deposit-Room, or Weighing-Room.—A "deposit" of any metal intended for coining, is first received into the weighing-room, and the first operation is the weighing. The unit of weight at the mint is the troy ounce, for any quantities however great; for subdivisions, the decimals (tenths, hundredths, . . .) are used. In this department, the largest weight is of 500 ounces, the smallest is the one-thousandth of an ounce—equal to 41⅔ pounds and forty-eight hundredths of a grain, respectively. The scales are of the most perfect workmanship, and wonderfully sensitive; they are adjusted carefully every morning. It is estimated that more than 1½ billions of dollars worth of gold alone has been received and weighed in this room. This is largely in excess of the gold coined, the difference consisting of the portion that has been refined and sold, uncoined, to jewellers and other manufacturers, or shipped to foreign countries.

Melting-Room.—After the metal has been carefully weighed in the presence of the proper officials, it is locked in iron boxes and transferred to the melting-room. Here the metal is mixed with the proper fluxes, melted in iron crucibles and run into iron moulds. Having been allowed to cool, it is again taken to the weighing-room and reweighed. Then the assayer cuts a small piece from each melt, and from the subsequent assay calculates the amount to be paid to the depositor.

Assay-Room—Parting-Room.—Assaying is the process of chemical analysis by which the component parts of an alloy, natural or artificial, and their proportions, are determined. Parting is the actual separating and recovering of the several metals. The former operation is performed on only a very small portion of the deposit (say, a small fraction of an ounce), and must be done with the utmost possible exactness. Any error, on either side, would be multiplied as many times as that fraction of an ounce is contained in the weight of the total deposit. Suppose, for example, that a man deposit what is intrinsically worth $50,000, and that the assay were astray to the one-thousandth part; this would mean that he would receive $50 more (or less) than the just price. Of course, men do not desire to receive more than is their due, neither is the government anxious to pay them more, and *vice versâ;* and therefore the assayer must endeavor to hold the balance as true as his art will permit.

Some of the weights used on the delicate assay-balance are almost microscopic, the smallest one being equal to the $\frac{1}{1800}$ of a grain, or the $\frac{1}{624000}$ of an ounce, and is almost invisible to the naked eye, except on a dark background and in a very good light.

The parting, or separating, is performed on the whole quantities of metal used, and an error in this part of the work would simply stand

alone, and not be multiplied, as in the case of an assay. We shall not attempt to describe in detail either of these processes. It would occupy too much valuable space, and would hardly be of an absorbing interest to the non-technical reader. However, should our readers insist *very* strongly on it, we make a solemn promise now to describe the whole operations, chemical and otherwise, in a future number of the QUARTERLY. The assaying and refining of gold and silver for coinage and for industrial purposes has become a business of such magnitude that it would be impossible to handle it all in the regular coining mints. For this reason "assay offices" have from time to time been established for this sole purpose. There is at present an assay office in each of the following places:

New York City, 30 and 32 Wall Street;
St. Louis, Mo., cor. Third and Oliver Streets;
Denver, Colo.;
Helena, Mont.;
Boise City, Idaho;
Charlotte, N. C.

We believe, also, that the defunct mint of Carson City, Nev., will be retained as an assay office. The amount of metal handled by these offices during the fiscal year 1892–93 was valued at $31,115,802.61, showing that they have not existed in vain.

Alloying.—When the gold and silver of an ore have been separated from all baser metals, as copper, lead, etc., and cast into bars, the bars are said to have been *refined;* they are also called "unparted bullion." When the gold and silver have been *parted* from each other, they are called "*fine.*" Perfectly fine means perfectly pure, but for practical purposes bars containing 99 per cent. of pure metal are considered as fine. Pure metal, whether gold or silver, is not suitable for coining; it is too soft and wears away too rapidly, but when alloyed with a certain percentage of copper it is rendered harder and much more durable, while its color is not appreciably injured. The *fineness* of a piece of gold or silver means the proportion of pure metal which it contains, and is expressed in thousandths. United States coin is $\frac{900}{1000}$, or .900, fine. Jewellers, however, usually indicate the fineness of their wares in "carats," pure metal being 24 carats. Thus, 22 carats means $\frac{22}{24}$ fine, and this is the standard of the British Mint. It is a little higher than our standard, being in decimals, .916⅔.

When, now, it is time to make a melt, the fine metal is mixed with the proper proportion of copper, melted and poured into moulds. These castings, called ingots, are almost 12 inches long, ½-inch thick, and vary from 1 to 2½ inches in width, according to the coin intended to be made from them. The narrower gold ingot is worth about $690, the wider one nearly $1500, the silver ones "according to the price current with the merchant."

Rolling, Drawing and Punching.—The ingot is now passed through a powerful rolling machine, over and over again, till it has been stretched to a strip about six feet in length. But even rolling will not make it

perfectly true, and hence it is drawn, in another powerful machine, called the drawing-bench, between strong steel pegs firmly fixed at the proper distance apart, according to the thickness of the intended coin. The strip is thus made of perfectly even gauge throughout. A punching-machine now takes a hand in the work, and cuts from the precious strip disks, or "planchets," as they are called, of the proper size, which, however, is a little larger than the coin will eventually be. They are perfectly flat and are smooth on the edges. If all has gone well, the planchets will be of the correct weight; if not, and if they be a trifle heavy, they will be adjusted by filing; if too light, the strip must be melted down again. About four-fifths of the weight of the strip goes into the planchets; the rest is scrap, and must be melted down in the next batch. Cleaning by acid and heat complete the operations up to the next stage, which is the milling.

Milling.—For this operation the planchets are fed into a machine by which they are forced edgewise against the face of a revolving wheel, by which means their edges are turned up, and made thicker than the rest of the piece, and the diameter of all is made perfectly exact. This milling, as it is called, serves to protect the piece from abrasion when in use.

The Dies.—In photography we give the name "negative" to a picture in which all the "lights" are dark, and all the "darks" light; so in coining we may call a die the "negative" of the coin, for in it all the depressions correspond to hills in the coin, and all the hills to depressions. A die is made by engraving, or as it is called, by *sinking*, the required figures and letters in a piece of soft steel. After being hardened, or tempered, this negative would serve for coining; but as, in case of breakage or other accident, it could not be reproduced, it has been found wiser to use it solely for the production of other negatives. So by its use under an enormous pressure, a "positive" is made in soft steel. This is then hardened, and from it in like manner, is obtained a second negative (or any desired number of them), and this is used as the coining die. A die will stand about two weeks' steady work.

Coining.—If we are not mistaken, all is now ready for the final operation, for which all the rest is only a preparation; this is the *coining*. We have already said that in ancient times coining was done by the power of human muscles, or horse-flesh. The ancient times lasted very long, for the first steam coining press was invented by Mr. Thonnelier of France in 1833, and was first used in this country in 1836. That press is still in working order, and was used in coining the Lord's Prayer "medallets," at the Columbian Exposition last year. The presses now in use are the outcome of many improvements on former inventions, and are the very perfection of modern mechanism. Immense power, astonishing rapidity of action, wonderful delicacy of touch, exactness to a hair's breadth in operation, complete responsiveness almost to the very thought of the attendant, and comeliness withal, combine to render them a marvel among human inventions.

The planchets are fed into an upright tube, from which a pair of

steel fingers seize one, which they deposit on the lower die of the press. The die is surrounded by a collar which is marked with vertical nicks on the inside all the way round. The upper die then descends steadily and noiselessly, under a pressure of from twenty to eighty tons, according to the size of the planchet, and all is over for that coin. The collar keeps the planchet true between the dies, and at the same time produces the serrated edges which render successful "clipping" almost an impossibility. In minor coins (nickel, bronze, etc.), the edges are left smooth. But now the jaws of the press open again, and the fingers, while removing the coined piece, grasp a second planchet and place it in position between the dies, to receive the same strong impression; and so on, at the rate of from 70 to 120 coins per minute. If employed in making double eagles, a single press, at its prettiest, would turn out $144,000 per hour. About one-half per cent. of the coins will probably be found in one way or another defective, and will not be allowed to pass into circulation; but we would be willing to have a few, just a few, of them, however.

Since it is not given to man to attain to absolute perfection, some allowance for error in the weight of the coins must be made. According to law, the deviation from standard weight, when the coins are delivered to the Treasurer, must not exceed 3 pennyweights, or 72 grains, in 1000 double-eagles; which is equivalent to one part in twelve thousand, by weight. This looks like close work; but all who are engaged in the mint take an honest pride in keeping the coins well within the limit allowed.

Counting.—"Don't count your chickens before they are hatched," says the adage, but here the chickens are being hatched faster than we can count. Well, then, we shall have to do the counting by machinery, and the machine employed is capable of counting into bags, putting the right number into each bag, at the rate of five hundred pieces a minute; and you can have several machines going at once. This machine, however, is mostly used for the smaller pieces; the larger ones are weighed, and the count calculated from the weight. After the counting, the money is ready to be paid, or given, or thrown away, as circumstances may require.

There are many other interesting points connected with our mint on which we have not had time to touch, among others, the *personnel*, including directors, superintendents, engravers, melters, refiners, coiners, assayers, and all who have worked in the mint, from the first day of its existence. It is well worth recording that of all that army, engaged in a naturally dangerous occupation, with temptations all around them, not a single one has ever made a false step, or even incurred a shadow of suspicion. And last, but not to be forgotten, was "Peter," the bird of the mint. "He was an inhabitant of the mint for six years. He would fly about the city, but no one interfered with the coming or the going of the 'Mint Bird,' and he never failed to return from his daily exercise before the time for closing the building. In an evil hour, he unfortunately perched upon a large fly-wheel, and getting caught in the

machinery, received a fatal injury to his wing, and this ended rather an unusual career for an eagle."—(Evans.) His exact portrait is upon the first nickel cent pieces coined in 1856.

The Cabinet.—We cannot leave this subject without saying at least a word about the "Cabinet." In it will be found a certain number of curiosities, among which is "Peter," as large as life. Then we have coins from all lands, and of all the ages since coining began. An interesting specimen is a small coin labelled "The Widow's Mite." It is not pretended that this is one of the two pieces given by the widow, but it is sufficiently well proved that it is a genuine coin of the same kind and time. There is one relic, however, which is *not* to be found in the mint, although an old lady from New England searched for it diligently, and that is "The Ax of the Apostles."

We desire here to acknowledge our indebtedness for much of the matter contained in this article to the "History of the United States Mint," by George G. Evans; and also to the official "Report of the United States Mint," by the Hon. Director of the Mint, R. E. Preston.

T. J. A. Freeman, S. J.

Book Notices.

I. Cursus Philos. in Usum Scholarum Auctoribus Pluribus Philos. Professoribus in Collegiis Exactensi et Stonyhurstensi S J. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis. 1894

1. Logica, in Usum Scholarum, auctore *Carolo Frick, S.J.* Pp. viii., 296. Price $1.20.
2. Ontologia, in Usum Scholarum, eodem auctore. Pp. viii , 204. Price $1.00.
3. Philosophia Naturalis, in Usum Scholarum, auctore *Henr. Haan, S J.* Pp. viii., 219. Price $1.00.

II. Bibliotheca Theologiae et Philosophiae Scholacticae Selecta atque Composita. A *Francisco Ehrle, S.J.* Summa Philosophiae ex variis Libris D. Thomae Aquinatis in Ordinem Cursus Philosophici Accomodata, a *Cosmo Alamanno, S.J* Editio Juxta Alteram Parisiensem Vulgatam a Can. Reg. Ord. S Aug. Congr. Gallicanae Adornata ab *Augustino Bringmann, S.J.* Tom. III. Sectio V., Ethica, pp. x., 216; et Sectio VI., Metaphysica, pp. xviii., 625. Price $4.50. Lethielleux, Parisiis, Fred. Pustet, New York.

I.

With the exception of the experimental parts of psychology this list of works on philosophy forms a complete course on that science—a graded course, leading from the elements of logic, through the solidities of ontology, in its modern scope, across the realm of natural philosophy, along the lines of human conduct down into the profundities of pure metaphysics, the Prima Philosophia of Aristotle and the schoolmen, the fundamental science, where the roots of all being, becoming and knowing are buried. The first three volumes on our list form as many sequent sections of a special course in philosophy now being produced by the skilled hands of the German Jesuits—a course running somewhat parallel to the more profound and erudite *Curcus Lacensis*, a notice of the last volume of which, Father Hontheim's *Theodicy*, appeared in the April number of this Review. The present series is designed for the use of schools as text-books for class-use, whilst the Marien Laach Course constitutes a mine which professors or quite advanced students can best work. The volume on Ethics by Father Cathrein, so widely famed for his German works on the same subject, was published last year. The volumes on Pyschology and Natural Theology are promised for the near future.

1. The Logic is built on the familiar lines of form and matter. It enters into the thinking process with its acts and norms, into its conformity to objects which results in mental truth, and into the tenacity of such truth in the mind. The whole is a happy illustration of the *logica docens* as *simul utens*. It teaches the *modi sciendi* by its own scientific use of them. Its adequate and clean-cut *divisions*, its brief yet clearly drawn definitions, its pithy, yet comprehensive *theses* with their well wrought *arguments*, strongly presented counter-objections with their neat incisive solutions and suggestive scholia—these essentials of logical discipline are admirable object-lessons of the theory which the book unfolds.

Logic with our author is more than a science of merely mental forms. It is a science illumining the intellect as to objective realities. An all

around study of the cognitive act shows that when viewed inwards it shows itself as a mere psychic state; when viewed outwards it presents to its subject things as they are. Created objects whereat the act terminates exist as limited, changeable, and are revealed in the cognitive act as contingent, dependent. From these contingent, dependent realities the mind concludes to the existence of God, the Infinite, the Necessary, the Independent, the first Efficient, Exemplary, and Final Cause of all that is outside of Himself. As created things have from God, the First Truth, in the ontological order, their reality, truth and cognoscibility, so too in the logical order they lead the mind to a certain knowledge of their Source and Archetype and End. The complete vindication therefore of the truth and certitude of the cognitive act as established by our author involves the demonstration of the one safe way whereby the mind in the natural order arrives at a certain knowledge of God. And so logic, as to its objective sides, at least, is a preamble to natural theology.

2. The second volume covers the familiar ground of general metaphysics—Being as Transcendental (Bk. I.); as falling into the Aristotelian Categories (Bk. II.); as possessed of certain far-reaching perfections, simplicity, infinitude and necessity. There is little room here for striking out original paths. Much is gained when an author is able to guide his followers safely and without over-strain through such a mountain land of mist and fog. This Fr. Frick certainly does. He has not made ontology easy, but he has given steady light and pointed out safe paths. And this he does because he has himself been guided by experienced leaders. St. Thomas, of course, and Suarez, have influenced most his presentation of scholastic metaphysics, though later thinkers, especially Kleutgen, Pesch, DeSar, Schiffini, have left no inconsiderable impression on his work. But his work is no compilation. The thoughts of giant minds have passed through the alembic of his own thinking, and are here set forth in the form that comes of his own individuality.

3. To natural philosophy is assigned the realm of nature viewed in the light of higher metaphysical principles. Its scope is to give a rational explanation of the essence of matter. Questions regarding the origin and purpose of the universe are relegated to natural theology, whilst some topics frequently treated of in empirical psychology find a place here.

Fr. Haan goes into his subject *inductively*. Taking up first what he calls the *inactive* properties of all bodies, extension, place, space and sensible qualities (the latter are, of course, *partly active properties*) (Bk. I.), he passes then to the active properties, efficient and final causality, motion, natural laws (Bk. II.), coming next to the region of life—life in general, its divisions and principles (Bk. III.), and in particular in plants (Bk. IV.) and in animals (Bk. V.). The analysis of all this material furnishes the data for a well-grounded theory as to the essence or nature of bodies. Such a theory, he maintains, is not presented by Pure Atomism (p. 177) nor by Dynamism (p. 179). As to Chemical Atomism, though offering a good working hypothesis for experimental chemistry, it falls short of an explanation of the essence of bodies (p. 184). The peripatetic teaching as to matter and form affords a rational explanation of the problem. This theory is explained at some length, not in a vague, merely *a priori* fashion, but with a watchful eye for the facts of chemical and biological experimentation, and with what may at times appear to the more rigid adherents to that theory a somewhat *liberal* spirit. We quote an instance: Bodies chemically compound differ as to their qualities from their component elements. It does not,

however, follow from this that water, *e.g.*, is a substance essentially different from oxygen and hydrogen, for the changes noticed in such a case cannot as yet be satisfactorily explained. If in the case of *isomeric* bodies the same elements combined in the same proportion give rise in different bodies to a difference in physical and chemical qualities, why may not the difference of qualities, say, in water, form the qualities of oxygen and hydrogen, be due to a difference in the combination of the elements, the substance of the latter remaining unchanged? (p. 175.)

We have just one feeling of regret as we look over the thoroughly-digested, well-ordered, and neatly-printed material of these three text-books, and that is that their authors did not take a broader view of the needs of their English-speaking clientele. Judging from the title-page of the second and third volumes, this Latin course might be regarded as somewhat of a companion to the Stonyhurst series of English manuals. As such its value would be much enhanced. The connection, however, is so very general as to commend the present series but little beyond any other Latin text. It might be said that our English philosophy is hardly more than German and French in another dress. Though this in some measure is true, a series of text-books in Latin with close bearing either on the Stonyhurst manuals, or at least on English philosophical literature, is a great desideratum.

As to the rest, the volumes before us are by far the best class books of philosophy that have thus far appeared. Their authors have struck the golden mean between too great brevity and too much discursiveness, whilst it is hard to see how the printers' and binders' arts could have made them more serviceable and attractive.

The last volume on our list completes the new edition of Cosmus Alamannus's "Summa Philosophica," one of the most important contributions to fundamental science that has appeared in modern times. Alamannus was born in Milan in the year 1559. At the age of sixteen he entered the Society of Jesus, and after completing his philosophical studies in his native city, was sent by his superior to Rome to attend the lectures of Suarez and Vasquez, then professing Theology in the Roman College. Four years afterwards, he was recalled to Milan to teach philosophy at the College of the Breva, which position he held for five years (1588–93), and was then elevated to the chair of Theology, which he occupied until 1606. During the following twenty years he was special theologian to the Episcopal See of Pavia, employing the time not officially consumed in compiling his great "Sum of Philosophy." The first volume of this work appeared at Pavia, in 1618, the fifth and last in 1623. The latter volume, embracing metaphysics, had not, however, covered the whole ground of its subject-matter, and he had written nothing on ethics. The rest of his life was spent, partly in priestly functions at the church of St. Fidelis, in Milan, partly in college duties at the Breva. The gaps he had left in his monumental work were afterwards supplied by Jean Fronteau, Canon Regular of St. Augustine and Chancellor of the Paris University, in a new edition, published in Paris in 1640.

The "Library of Scholastic Theology and Philosophy," whereof this new edition forms a part, was begun by the republication of Silvester Maurus's "Aristotle" (4 vols. 4to., 1885–6). The republication of Alamannus was undertaken at the desire of Leo. XIII., expressed in his brief to M. Pastet, April 17, 1883, and the first half of the first volume published in 1885, the other sections appearing at intervals up to the present date. The new edition has been based on the Paris edition, compared with various Mm. Codices, and with the author's own Pavian

edition. The editorial work, besides the collating just mentioned, has been very great, as it involved a minute verification of the myriad citations from Aristotle and St. Thomas.

The aim of Alamannus and his continuator, Fronteau, was to present a complete system of philosophy, drawn from the writings of St. Thomas. Having framed the system on the model of the "Summa Theologiæ," they compiled from all the works of the angelic doctor whatever they found to bear for and against its individual parts. The peculiar utility, therefore, of the work consists in its bringing into one compact system the multitudinous thoughts of the greatest of philosophers in their original form; for here, St. Thomas not only thinks but speaks. It were as presumptuous as superfluous in us to say anything in praise of such a work. Leo XIII. may more fittingly commend it. In his Brief to Mr. Pustet, referred to above, he says: "We hold this work in great esteem; in it, not only the philosophical teaching of the great master, Aquinas, are propounded in his own words, but in the propositions themselves, taken from him, his arguments are fully and faithfully presented, which, whilst demonstrating philosophically those propositions, are, at the same time, an opportune refutation of those who maintain that the angelic doctor did not rely on intrinsic rational proofs, but solely on the authority of Aristotle. Moreover, we have good reason to think that students of philosophy can draw from this work, so highly recommended by well-known testimonials of learned men, as from the genuine font, the wisdom of the great teacher."

THE RELIGIOUS FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES. Enumerated, Classified and Described on the Basis of the Government Census of 1890, with an Introduction on the Condition and Character of American Christianity. By H. K. Carroll, LL.D., in charge of the Division of Churches, Eleventh Census. New York: The Christian Literature Co. MDCCCXCII. Pages LXIII., 449 octavo.

The character and contents of this work are clearly described in its title. It is the first of a series of twelve volumes on American church history now in course of publication by the Christian Literature Company, 13 Astor Place, New York. The other volumes of this series will be special denominational histories prepared by authors of the different religious communions respectively. The present work, however, being general in its character, is complete in itself, and will be sold separately. It gives a very full and interesting statistical account of all the religious denominations in the country, together with a brief sketch of their history and distinctive features. The author had charge of the religious department (the Division of Churches) of the last census, and he has here given us in a very convenient and intelligible form the cream of all the information he was thus enabled to obtain. He evidently discharged his office with intelligent zeal and impartiality, and he has in consequence deservedly attained a measure of success that could scarcely be hoped for when we consider the method he was compelled to adopt.

"It should be understood," we are told, "that the census enumerators who take the population by domiciliary visitation are not allowed to ask individuals as to their religious connections."

This prohibition or neglect on the part of the census authorities is defended, or rather apologized for, on the grounds that "in the first place, they (the enumerators) have but a brief time in which to complete their work; in the second place, their schedules are already overburdened with inquiries; and, in the third place, the constitutional provision of the First Amendment restraining Congress from making any

'law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free, exercise thereof,' is interpreted as forbidding it." These reasons do not seem to us to have much weight. It is difficult to understand how, if the census enumerators were authorized to ask in addition to their other inquiries a question or two as to what religion, if any, was professed by the individuals enumerated, Congress could be said to have thereby made a "law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." It would take only a very few seconds to jot down the answers to such questions, and we believe they would be of more general interest and would be much more readily answered by the people generally than inquiries as to their indebtedness, mortgages, hereditary diseases, etc. We can see no good reason why our census reports should be in this respect inferior to those of Ireland, Australia, Canada, and other countries which have no established religion.

Being unable to adopt the simple and effective mode by which something like certain results could be obtained, Dr. Carroll was obliged to proceed by another, which he describes as follows: "The method of gathering the statistics was to make the presbytery, the classis, the association, the synod, the diocese, the conference, etc., the unit in the division of the work, and to ask the clerk or moderator or statistical secretary of each to obtain the desired information from the churches belonging to his presbytery, association or diocese, as the case might be. This officer received full instructions how to proceed and sufficient supplies of circulars, schedules, etc., to communicate with each church. This method proved to be quite practicable and very satisfactory. Several thousand agents thus gave information which they were best qualified to secure, and the results were found, when tests were applied, to be full and accurate. I may mention that, having a large force of clerks with ample supplies, a vast correspondence was conducted."

In this way much valuable information certainly was obtained; nevertheless, it becomes apparent at once that on several important points the census can, after all, only give us estimates, or calculations based on the estimates furnished by the diocesan, synodal and other authorities.

These estimates were, doubtless, made out carefully and honestly enough from the data on hand, but these data were no doubt often very far from being complete or perfect, and we are confident that in many cases the estimates and statistics based on them are not even approximately correct. We refer especially, but not exclusively, to the Catholic statistics.

The number of Roman Catholic communicants that is practically, of all who have made their first communion, which, as is correctly stated, is usually done between the ages of nine and eleven years, is given as 6,231,417, exclusive of the United Greek Catholics and other Orientals, who are few in number and are reckoned separately. These figures represent, of course, the returns made by the pastors or rectors of the various parishes; but in all the large city parishes where the same church, sometimes with the help of the basement and the school-house, usually serves every Sunday morning for from five, six or even more different congregations, it is next to impossible for the rector to be acquainted with all his parishioners or even to have any exact knowledge of their number. He is obliged to estimate, and his estimates for various reasons he is apt to place at the lowest figure consistent with any reasonable degree of probability. We were acquainted with a parish some years ago where, in the judgment of the assistants and others well capable of judging, the Catholic population amounted cer-

tainly to not less than 14,000 souls, yet, if any one should venture to intimate in the presence that there were more than 9000 or 10,000, he was sure to give considerable offense and to encounter an earnest protest. This may have been an extreme case, but it illustrates the general tendency. The parishes, in fact, are expected to contribute to the support of various diocesan and other institutions in some sort of proportions to their membership; and as in most parishes there may be found a number of families and of persons who contribute little or nothing to the Church's financial support, some pastors, we understand, think it right to omit them in the returns made to the bishop of the population or number of families under their care. Even in parishes where earnest endeavors have been made to ascertain the exact number of Catholics, it is almost invariably discovered when a new parish is started that many had been overlooked. Instead, then, of 6,231,417 Roman Catholic communicants, we think that if a full and correct count could be had the number would be found to fall little, if at all, short of 8,000,000.

Now, what proportion do these form of the total Catholic population? Catholic estimates, as furnished to the census authorities, place it at 8.5 per cent. We believe these estimates to be totally wrong. Taking the country as a whole we think that children under the age at which Catholics generally make their first communion will be found to form as high as 25 per cent. of the total population. Now, the children in Catholic families are not so few relatively as to fall 10 per cent. below the general average. On the contrary, it is pretty well ascertained that they exceed the general average by a considerable figure. We place, then, the number of baptized Catholics who have not made their first communion at 30 per cent. of the whole, and accordingly we are of the opinion that the total Catholic population of the country probably exceeds 11,000,000. This would account for nearly all of the 5,000,000 or more whom the author supposes to belong to the non-religious and anti-religious classes, and, indeed, we think it incredible that these classes should more than ten times outnumber the Jews and Mormons combined.

On the other hand, we are inclined to think that by multiplying the number of Protestant communicants by three and a half the Protestant population is placed somewhat too high. This may be a fair proportion in Canada, but in this country Protestant families are, we think, more divided, two and sometimes more members of a family communicating in as many different churches, or even denominations, and the rest of the family going sometimes with one, sometimes with another, and as likely to be reckoned two or three times over.

With all its drawbacks, however, the last census was, from a religious standpoint clearly a great improvement on its predecessors, and we heartily commend the present work as a most lucid and valuable presentation of its results in a form more generally interesting and serviceable than will be probably the complete census reports on this subject, which are not yet published.

AN EXAMINATION OF WEISMANNISM. By *George John Romanes, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.*, Honorary Fellow of Gouville and Caius College, Cambridge. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1893.

The recent death of Professor Romanes, in comparatively young manhood, gives to everything that came from his pen a certain pathetic interest quite in addition to its scientific value.

The volume before us is well worth the attention of all men who would keep themselves conversant with the efforts being so patiently made by the professed students of nature to lay bare its many mysteries.

Although the opinion expressed by Darwin in the "Origin of Species" and his other works relating to the same general subject have been, in a great measure, adopted by scientific men, yet, for some years past, there has been a tendency on the part of students of biology, and its cognate branches of material science, to separate themselves upon many of the subjects treated by Darwin. And of these subjects none possesses greater importance than the one to which the name of Weismann has been attached.

As is very well known, there has long been a difference of opinion upon the questions (1) whether acquired characters, *i.e.*, any post-natal mark or quality, can be transmitted to a succeeding generation; and (2) assuming that it can be, how is the transmission effected.

Darwin and Galton were of the opinion that, in certain exceptional cases, acquired characters are inherited; Weismann and his disciples deny the possibility.

In the work before us, Professor Romanes presents: (Chap. I.) "Statement of Weismann's System up to the Year 1886"; (Chap. II.) "Later Additions of Weismann's System up to the Year 1892"; (Chap. III.) "Weismann's Theory of Heredity (1891)"; (Chap. IV.) "Examination of Weismann's Theory of Evolution (1891)"; (Chap. V.) "Weismannism up to Date (1893)." In addition to the above, there is "Appendix I.—On Germ-Plasm"; "Appendix II.—On Telegony."

For the instruction of non-technical readers, there is a Glossary of the very technical terms used in the volume. In the Preface, Professor Romanes says "that under the term 'Weismannism' I do not include any reference to the important question with which the name of Weismann has been mainly associated, *i.e.*, the inheritance or non-inheritance of acquired characters. This is a question of fact which stands to be answered by the inductive methods of observation and experiment, not by the deductive methods of general reasoning. . . . . Therefore, in this 'examination of Weismannism,' I intend to restrict our attention to the elaborate system of theories which Weismann has reared upon his fundamental postulate of the non-inheritance of acquired characters, reserving for my next volume our consideration of this postulate itself."

In pursuance of the above statement of his object, Professor Romanes has, in the manner indicated by the titles of the chapters, given what he claims to be a fair *résumé* of the theories of Professor Weismann, all of which he subjects to rigid criticism for the purpose of showing Weismann's mistakes in fact and in inference. Besides this, Professor Romanes seeks to show that Weismann, in out-Darwining Darwin, has ended by being obliged to modify his most important postulates with respect to heredity and evolution.

Whether or not Romanes has always been quite fair in his statements of Weismann's views, is a question of great importance, and one that cannot be answered by merely reading the work of Romanes; but, however this may be, Professor Romanes writes with great clearness and precision, and, with the aid of the excellent Glossary, the non-professional reader need not feel himself overwhelmed by coming across such terms, for instance, as "phylogeny," "plasmogenetic characters," and a number of other equally unfamiliar combinations of letters.

In conclusion, it may be remarked that notwithstanding the wide differences still existing between students of nature as to the true interpre-

tation of many material phenomena, the great fact that, during the present half of this century, many questions have been answered which served only to perplex the men of former days, gives good reason to hope that many more of nature's secrets will be revealed in the future as a reward to investigators, and for the further enlightenment of mankind as to the underlying purpose of the material world.

W. R. C.

PURGATORY, ILLUSTRATED BY THE LIVES AND LEGENDS OF THE SAINTS. By *Rev. F. X. Shouppe, S. J.* Translated from the French. Cincinnati, New York and Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

The subject of Purgatory, or the state of purification after death, possesses for all men a melancholy interest. There are so many things that we want to know about it. Where is it, what are its sufferings, how long will they last, who are punished there, what alleviation of sufferings have they, can we assist them and how should we assist them and why, how can we avoid Purgatory? The Church commands us to believe that there is a Purgatory, and that we can assist the suffering souls by our prayers and other good works; all else that we are told about this mysterious prison-house is gathered from the dictates of reason, the teaching of the Fathers of the Church, and from private revelations. The author makes this distinction in his preface, and at the same time warns us against too great incredulity in supernatural facts. He adds: "The theologian who expounds dogmas of faith must be severe in the choice of proofs; the historian must proceed with rigorous circumspection in the narration of facts; but the ascetic writer, who cites examples to illustrate truths and edify the faithful, is not held to this strict rigor."

It is well that attention is called in the beginning to this attitude which is permitted to the ascetical writer. The examples that are quoted throughout the work, of the appearance of suffering souls and the revelations made by them, are always interesting, but they are frequently very strange and sometimes startling; it requires a very strong, simple faith to accept them all.

We believe that this book should be used by the laity only under the direction of a priest. It is so easy to mistake the creatures of dreams and imagination for apparitions and visions. We think that the description of the manner in which the suffering souls appear and manifest their presence should be read very cautiously, and explained very carefully to uneducated persons. The author says, quoting some one whose name is not given, that the spirits from Purgatory sometimes make their presence known by invisible blows which the living receive, by the violent shutting of doors, the rattling of chains and the sound of voices. We do not wish to deny that such things may have happened, but when we consider how easily such manifestations can almost invariably be accounted for according to physical laws, and how easily the imagination is excited in ignorant and nervous persons, we are tempted to think that such things had better be left unsaid. We are required by the teachings of theology to seek for natural explanations first and diligently, and the devil can certainly work great harm by taking advantage of unreasonable credulity in this matter. We know of an instance of this kind in which the imagination appeared to be the deceiving agent. A very pious lady imagined that her very pious daughter was receiving communications from departed spirits. These communications informed the lady that her deceased son was happy in heaven. Naturally, prayers for his release from Purgatory were given up. A little common-

sense investigation showed the imagination to be the invisible agent, and mother and daughter were cured. The author says that when these manifestations coincide with the death of persons dear to us, when they cease after prayers and reparations have been made to God in their behalf, it is reasonable to see therein signs by which the souls make known their distress. We think not. The physical cause of the manifestation may cease at that time; the devil often invites us to do good that he may more easily tempt us to sin; and prayers for the dead collectively and individually should never cease unless we have a revelation of their presence in heaven vouched for by the Catholic Church in the act of canonization.

On the whole, this work fulfils the object of its author, to make Purgatory better known to the faithful, that they may help others out of it and stay out of it themselves.

THE DATA OF MODERN ETHICS EXAMINED. By *Rev. John J. Ming, S. J.* Benziger Bros., New York.

No one who is acquainted with the scientific and popular literature of our age is ignorant of the ascendancy which materialistic and atheistic evolutionism has gained, both in this country and in Europe. Evolutionism, however, is not a merely theoretical speculation, indulged in for a pastime; it has its bearings on the practical life of mankind, so much so, that it tends to revolutionize the whole moral order, and to substitute a totally new moral code for the one which has hitherto been the norm and guide of private and social life.

It was an excellent plan, of the author of the handsome volume before us, to subject the data of modern ethics to a thorough examination. He has accomplished his task with the impartiality of one whose highest law is the love of truth, and with the skill of a perfect master in the province of ethical science. The result at which he has arrived is a complete condemnation of modern ethics, and a brilliant justification of Christian morals.

The author reviews the principal tenets of evolutionary ethics, and contrasts them with those of Christian philosophy. He enables the reader to get a clear insight into the modern theories which are brought before him, in numerous well-chosen and well-arranged quotations from leading writers, such as Stuart Mill, F. Harrison, Herbert Spencer, A. Bain, Huxley, Clifford, and others. The new theories are thoroughly discussed in all their details and bearings—no point of importance is overlooked or treated superficially. From chapter to chapter we see new portions of the showy structure of evolutionism crumble down, whilst, on the other hand, the grand system of Christian ethics is gradually brought out before the mind's eye with all its solidity, wonderful harmony, and beauty. Thus, the work is not only a refutation of errors, but, at the same time, a complete treatise of true morality from the standpoint of enlightened reason.

To give an idea of the rich contents of the volume, it will suffice to mention the principal subjects which are treated: The drift of the new ethical theories; the moral nature of man; man's ultimate end; the nature of good and evil; moral ideals; the moral order as a divine law; the moral order emancipated; independent morality and law; the moral sense; social rights and duties, justice, and beneficence. Whosoever follows the author attentively, will agree with the verdict in the last chapter—that the new morality is a complete failure; by it, "the entire foundation of morality is completely overthrown; no part whatsoever

is left of it, neither the ultimate end nor the light that shows the way to it, neither good nor evil, neither law nor conscience, neither reward nor punishment, neither justice nor love."

How important it is that all should be thoroughly convinced of the truth of these and similar charges, appears from the fact that "the new theories have been devised as the basis of modern education, and are meant to be carried into practice." Those who have the welfare of mankind at heart will find in "The Data of Modern Ethics Examined" most powerful weapons against the pernicious errors of agnostics and infidels. We warmly recommend the work to all who are interested in the preservation and advancement of true morality, especially to those who, by their calling, are to enlighten and to guide others.

We may add, that the external appearance of the volume is very pleasing, and does great credit to the publishers. The print and arrangement of the text, with a summary of the contents prefixed to each chapter, is admirably adapted to help the reader towards a perfect understanding of the various subjects. We venture to say, that no one who has gone through the book will lay it aside without having found abundant light on the gravest questions, and without taking it up again for deeper consideration.

GESCHICTE DES DEUTSCHEN VOLKES SEIT DEM AUSGANG DES MITTELALTERS VON JOHANNES JANSSEN: CULTURZUSTANDE DES DEUTSCHEN VOLKES SEIT DEM AUSGANG DES MITTELALTERS BIS ZUM BEGINN DES DREISZIGJÄHRIGEN KRIEGS. Siebenter Band, Drittes Buch, von *Johannes Janssen*, ergänst and herausgegeben von Ludwig Pastor. Erste his Zwölfte Auflage. Pp. xlvii., 660. Herder: St. Louis. 1893. Price, $2.10.

With the sixth volume of his great history, Dr. Janssen discontinued his narrative of the political life of post-mediæval Germany, to sketch the state and progress of general culture amongst the Germans from the close of the Middle Ages on to the breaking out of the Thirty Years' War. The two books contained in that volume portray the condition of Art and General Literature during that period. The third book embraced by the present, the seventh volume, unfolds with great fullness the history of the German Schools and Universities, Science and Education. Though much of the crude material for this important work was left by the author, yet the task of shaping, polishing, filling out, fell upon the editor, Dr. Pastor, whilst the chapter on the State of Natural Science, Medicine, Theology and Philosophy amongst the Catholics, translations of the Bible into German by Catholics and Protestants, is entirely from the pen of the latter.

It is impossible to overestimate the importance and the interest of the subjects covered by this volume. It follows to the first trickling springs the torrents of thought, feeling, action, that swept on the German people and after them the other European nations into the depths of the Reformation. It deals not with generalities save when they are evidently induced from the contemporaneous facts marshalled, with the badge of their origin on them, before the reader. It enters into the school life of the German children as it was before and after the breaking out of the new preaching, tracing with minuteness the influence of the latter; describes the schools as they were founded and managed by Protestants and Catholics, the untiring activity of the Jesuits in the cause of education, the contrast between the system adopted by the latter and that pursued by the disciples of the new teaching. From the school we are taken to the university and introduced to student life as it was, both under the influence of the old and of the new religion. The relation of

Humanism to its environment, the evolution of philology, the study and influence of jurisprudence, the progress of historical writing, of mathematics and astronomy, of medicine, of philosophy and theology, of vernacular translations of the Bible, of exegesis, of the censorship of the press, the printing and circulation of books, the beginning and development of newspapers—the mere mention of these titles stimulates the reader's energy to follow a guide who explores these regions, which by careful study he has made peculiarly his own, and who, whilst he is careful to point out the good elements in a people, its institutions, its public and private life, is impartially unsparing in showing up evil of whatever kind and whereever it may exist. "Magna est veritas et prævalebit,"—these words, the last which he penned, indicate the spirit in which he wrought and the temper of his work. Dr. Janssen's treatment of the old and new educational institutions is so thorough and of such practical bearing on present theories, that it were well if some able hand wrought it out into English.

Dr. Pastor informs his readers that Dr. Janssen left him many literary suggestions, helpful for the completion of this history, down to 1856, and that after the publication of his (Pastor's) now well nigh completed third volume of the "History of the Popes," he intends devoting all his energies to the continuation of Janssen's "History of the Germans," so that notwithstanding the death of its illustrious author, the prospects of having this most thorough of histories brought to a worthy completion are very encouraging.

THE DISEASES OF PERSONALITY. By *Th. Ribot.* Chicago: Open Court Publ. Co. 1894.

A compilation this of some curious facts, such as may be excerpted from easily obtained books on mental physiology or physiological psychology, strung together on a thread of weak metaphysics. M. Ribot, we know, has registered elsewhere, and shows no effort to conceal here his hatred of metaphysics. But all his writings show him at least in metaphysical pantomine. Besides this general variation between his profession and practice, his present brochure contains many a gratuitous assumption and error. After starting with the general meaning of "person" as "the individual as clearly conscious of itself and acting accordingly," a definition which a tyro in metaphysics would tear to shreds, he asks what is consciousness? "Leaving aside details," he says, "we are confronted by two hypotheses: the one a very old hypothesis which regards consciousness as the basic property of 'soul' or of 'mind,' *constituting its essence* (italics ours); the other a very recent theory which regards it as a simple phenomenon, superadded to the activity of the brain, as an event having its own conditions of existence, and which appears or disappears according to circumstances." Is M. Ribot setting up a man of straw, or does he not know that there is a third thesis (not hypothesis), defended by the majority of genuine philosophers of all time, which regards consciousness as a property, a faculty, if you will, though our author hates the word, or a state of the human soul or mind? Who but the Cartesian school holds that consciousness is the "*essence of soul?*"

The precise point the author wishes to make is apparently this: "The co-ordination of the innumerable nervous actions of the organic life is the basis of the physical and psychical personality; all other co-ordinations rest upon and are added to it; it is the inner man, the material form of his subjectivity, the alternate reason of his manner of feeling

and acting, the source of his instincts, his sentiments and his passions, and, as they used to say in the Middle Ages, his principle of individuation," 148. This position M. Ribot strives to make good by a large number of morbid conditions, organic, emotional, intellectual, wherein consciousness of personal identity is more or less disturbed or destroyed. The facts, however, lend themselves just as readily to the theory he opposes. The organism, with its nervous states, is the coefficient necessary directly or indirectly to all psychic action; its abnormal states superinduce disturbances in consciousness and in the recognition of personality; but it is quite gratuitous and wrong to infer that the organism became necessary to action, and partly constitutive, too, in personality is the root principle of personality, the source of psychic life. Every elementary treatise in rational psychology shows the illicitude of such a sequence and the falseness of such a consequence.

Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntnisz. Eine Apologetische geschichtliche Studie, mit Rücksicht auf den Kampf um das Apostolicum Von *Clemens Blume, S. J.* Pp. xvi., 304. Herder: St. Louis. 1893. Pr. $1.15.

When one considers the Vandalic treatment to which the Sacred Scriptures have been subjected in recent times, he is not surprised to see that venerable symbol of Christian belief, the Apostle's creed, sharing a like fate. The wonder is, that this formula of belief should have so long survived amidst the conflicts waged against what Protestantism defends as its sole basis of faith, the Bible. But the point of attack is now against what even the jarring sects have all along regarded as the common bond of Christendom. The attack is championed not simply by rationalism, but by professed Christians. Foremost amongst those who reject the Apostolic origin of the creed, and who are working for its revision to suit the advanced scholarship of the day, is Dr. Adolph Harnack, Professor of (Protestant) Theology in the Berlin University. Readers of this Review have been made familiar with Doctor Harnack's theories regarding primitive Christianity by Fr. Hewit's able critique of his "Outlines of the History of Dogma," in the October number of last year. Harnack's "Historical Account of the Apostles' Creed" was published two years ago, and since that time has become widely popular in Germany. Occasion is taken of this essay, by the author of the book before us, to write, not so much a critique of counter theories, as a positive defence of the apostolicity of the symbol of faith. He analyzes the true meaning of the term "apostolic," as contrasted with its caricature as set forth by Harnack in his "History of Dogma"; compares the historical investigation (in symbolism) and its results, as carried on by Catholic and Protestant scholars; and follows the history of the creed both as a whole and as to each of its individual articles, dwelling especially on the testimony of the first three centuries in its favor. The explanatory literature on the Apostles' Creed is well nigh boundless, but works on its *history* by Catholic pens are easily counted. This scarcity is, of course, due to the obvious reason that the Catholic takes his belief, not from historical testimony, but from the living Church. The history, therefore, of the formula of his profession of faith is to him of secondary importance. There is, however, interest in knowing in what sense the terms, wherein he expresses his faith, have come down from the Apostles themselves, and when, and how, and why, individual articles of faith came to have the precise form wherein they are recited for him at his baptism, and wherein he learns them in early childhood. Such information he can obtain from the work before us—

information one feels he may thoroughly trust, based as it is on the author's broad and deep knowledge of history and thorough criticism.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH AND THE SEE OF PETER. By the *Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A.*, Magdalen College, Oxford. With an Introduction by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. London: Longmans, Green & Co. New York: 15 East Sixteenth Street. 1894.

It is most fortunate that Father Rivington has been, in a measure, compelled by personal attacks to go over systematically the familiar ground of the status of the Papacy in the primitive Church. No one could perform the task better than one with whom the question of Rome's supremacy has been, not an academic thesis, but the subject of a life-long and anxious inquiry. This circumstance adds to the interest with which we follow the author step by step from Clement of Rome to the Council of Chalcedon. It is difficult to understand how any honest reader who peruses the documents of antiquity, marshalled with consummate skill by Father Rivington, can fail to arrive at the conclusion with which he sums up his argument: "The verdict, then, of history, so far as the period dealt with above is concerned, is this: In the earliest records of the Christian Church agreement with Rome in matters of faith is seen to be a principle, clearly announced by St. Irenæus, which does not grow or develop as a substantial truth, but which becomes clearer in its action, and more definitely recognized, as time goes on."

The clear recognition of this *principle* is all that we can reasonably expect from the ancients. It was only in proportion as circumstances developed the details of the Papal prerogative that the attention of men was drawn to consider the full weight of the immortal words: "Tu es Petrus," precisely as the Christological controversies compelled men to draw out the full import of the words: "The Father and I are one." Neither is it to be wondered at if the Roman Pontiffs were the first to appreciate the nature and extent of their powers, or that their intervention, which always was occasioned by disturbances, should be resented by the party against whom they decided. It is in the nature of things that any new exercise of supreme prerogative should be resisted; nor need we go beyond the history of our own Republic to find illustrations. Whilst the course of our history ran smoothly, we scarcely felt the presence of a supreme executive amongst us. But with the rise of civil commotion and insurrection, the powers of the President, expressed in vague terms in the Constitution, were exerted with a vigor and to an extent which called forth cries of "usurpation," "innovation," and the like; cries familiar to readers of church history. It is instructive to remember that not until this one hundred and eighteenth year of our liberties was it ascertained that the President has the constitutional right and duty of clearing the way for mail trains and inter-State commerce, even at the point of Federal bayonets, and without regard to the feelings of local authorities. As it would be ridiculous to demand of Mr. Lincoln or Mr. Cleveland that they should produce exact precedents for their actions in the administration of Washington or Adams, so would it be absurd to demand that a modern Pope should be compelled to quote precedents from the early Pontiffs. It is quite sufficient, to use the forcible similes of the author, that they should resemble each other as the oak resembles the acorn, or a grown man resembles a child. The development of Roman supremacy has followed the same course as all other dogmas of Christianity. If so learned a man as Eusebius held views of

dubious orthodoxy regarding the divinity of Christ, why need we wonder if he and others like him, had not fathomed the powers of the Roman Pontiff?

We are much pleased to notice that Father Rivington inclines decidedly to that interpretation of the famous sixth canon of Nice, which was adopted by Bellarmine and Baronius. In our opinion it is the only tenable interpretation, and we deem it very regrettable that any other should have found supporters among Catholic writers.

We heartily recommend this book, therefore, to our readers. There is nothing abstruse about it from beginning to end; the course of the argument is easy to follow, and one rises from the perusal of it with a feeling of deep gratitude to the distinguished convert who has employed the great talents with which God has endowed him in the noblest and divinest of causes—the vindication of Catholic truth. May we often be favored with the products of his brilliant pen.

DANTE'S DIVINA COMMEDIA: ITS SCOPE AND VALUE. From the German of Franz Hettinger, D.D. Edited by H. S. Bowden, of the Oratory. Second edition, revised. London: Burns & Oates. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1894.

The general awakening of interest throughout the country in Dante's immortal poem is one of the most promising signs of the times. Yet the vast majority of those who dip into the great master's pages find him as unintelligible, however much they may admire detached passages, as the eunuch of old found the inspired pages of Isaias. The reason is obvious. The "Divina Commedia" is no mere jingling of rhymes, meant to while away an idle hour. It is the life-work of a philosopher, a theologian and an active and much-buffeted statesman, who has thrown into poetic shape all the knowledge which he and his age possessed. To appreciate Dante, one must, first of all, be a Catholic, thoroughly imbued with a lively and intelligent faith. That vague sentimentality which passes for religion in the present age has nothing in common with the vividness with which the Florentine seer beholds the scenes in the triple kingdom beyond the mystical wood, as plainly as one discerns men and things in the bright atmosphere of Tuscany.

Numerous passages of exquisite beauty are lost upon the general reader through unacquaintance with the philosophy and theology of the schools in which Dante was deeply versed, to such an extent, indeed, that his poem has been considered a metrical rendition of St. Thomas' "Summa."

That an intimate knowledge of the political situation in the Italy of Dante's age is indispensable to an intelligent reading of his masterpiece, is patent on the first glance at the poem. Dante sends more people to Hell for Guelphism than for any violation of the decalogue. In fact, his popularity among Liberals and non-Catholics generally is, in large part, owing to the wholesale way in which he devotes Popes and high ecclesiastics to eternal perdition.

It is evident, then, that Dante is a sealed book to the multitude without a competent guide; and no more competent guide can be found than the illustrious author of the "Apology of Christianity," whose essay on the scope and value of the "Divine Comedy" is now presented in attractive shape, to the English public by Father Bowden. As we are very desirous that the study of Dante should be widely propagated among educated Catholics, we earnestly pray our clergy to possess themselves of copies of Dr. Hettinger's admirable treatise.

With all his violent prejudices, the prejudices of a strong man smarting under undeserved outrages, Dante is eminently the Catholic poet, without predecessor or successor. As Hettinger eloquently puts it, "Dante was human, and therefore liable to err. His errors have long since passed into oblivion, but his great work belongs to mankind for all time. As long as one heart on earth beats with love for the sacred things of human nature: freedom, wisdom, faith, so long will the name of the author of the 'Divina Commedia' be loved and revered."

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRAECE ET LATINE. Textum Graecum recensuit, Latinum ex Vulgata Editione Clementina adjunxit, breves capitulorum inscriptiones et locos parallelos addidit *Fridericus Brandscheid*, gymnasii Hadamarensis olim corrector. Cum approbatione Rev. Archiep., Friburg. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. 1893. Price, $2.10, net.

Let us thank God and be grateful to Professor Brandscheid that at length Catholic students of limited means have at hand and within reach an edition of the New Testament, in Latin and Greek, in which they may place implicit trust, as embodying the very latest results of textual criticism. In establishing the true reading of the Greek text, the author avails himself of the labors of Lachmann, Tregelles, Dischendorf, and Westcott-Hort. Parallel with the Greek runs the Latin version, the Vulgate of Sixtus V. and Clement VIII., as edited by Vercellone, "ne minima quidem, quod sciam, particula de textu mutata, addita vel ab eo detracta." It is obvious that this precious volume will be of immense advantage to professors and students of theology, whether in scriptural or dogmatic classes, and we sincerely trust that a copy will be found opened before every theological student in each one of our seminaries.

As a companion volume to his more important work, the author has issued in the German language a "Manual of Introduction to the New Testament," which is also a model of clearness and precision, giving, in the briefest compass, a full exposition of the history of the text of the New Testament from apostolic times to our own day, with such other information as is usually to be found in well-written *Prolegomena* to the Holy Scriptures. This book is sold for $2, and will be invaluable to those who are masters of the German tongue.

THE WORLD'S PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS. An illustrated and popular story of the World's First Parliament of Religions, held in Chicago in connection with the Columbian Exposition of 1893. Edited by the Rev. John Henry Barrows, D D., Chairman of the General Committee of Religious Congresses of the World's Congress Auxiliary. Chicago: The Parliament Publishing Company. 1893.

Two contrary opinions were and still are held respecting the expediency of convoking this famous "parliament of religions." On the one side it was argued that the great exposition would be sadly defective if it were confined to a display of human progress in the field of material achievement. "Should not man's intellectual and moral progress," it was asked, "be adequately set forth amid these material splendors?" On the other hand it was contended, not exactly as stated by our author, "that Religion is such in its nature that it cannot be exhibited," but rather, that the bewildering excitement and dissipation of soul caused by the scenes and surroundings of a World's Fair left the public in no fit frame of mind for the calm and sublime study of religious truths, and consequently, it was feared the spectacle of so many diverse and irreconcilable religions was likely to leave upon the minds of those to whom the "parliament" was but a side-show in a colossal circus the impres-

sion, analogous to a composite photograph, that all religion was but a strange and antiquated illusion, a relic of departed ages.

The effect produced by the parliament upon Dr. Barrows himself, is expressed by him in his preface in words too enthusiastic and poetical for comprehension by the dull mind of the ordinary reader. "Striking the noble chord of universal human brotherhood," he says, "the promoters of the World's First Parliament of Religions have evoked a starry music which will yet drown the miserable discords of earth." Beautifully said, could one but understand what it means. But in cold reality, we can see but two ways of "drowning the miserable discords of earth," so far as religion is concerned. 1. By lifting humanity up to the supernatural plane of Christ's Holy Catholic Faith, or 2. By letting humanity down into the abyss of universal negation of the spiritual and the immortal.

But the Parliament is now become a matter of history, and it was but right it should have its historian. In the two bulky octavos before us, the history is thoroughly and appreciatively told by one who for three years worked with indefatigable zeal to secure the success of this novel undertaking. There are some admirable papers by the profoundest religious thinkers of the age; and these ought to, at least, counteract the effect of the others on Buddhism, Shintoism, and a hundred other Isms. The many illustrations give a panorama of the religious world which one could scarcely find elsewhere in so convenient a shape.

LE CONCLAVE; Origines, Histoire, Organization, Legislation Ancienne et Moderne; avec un appendice contenant le texte des *Bulles Secrètes* de Pie IX. par *Lucius Lector.* Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1894. Pp., 779.

In this bulky little volume, the author, with the aid of ancient documents, and gathering up the results of recent German erudition and French science (thus he distributes the national talents), has given a much needed *résumé* of the laws regulating the election of the Roman Pontiff. The Roman Pontificate has, from the beginning, been elective; but the method of election has varied considerably with the progress of time. At first, the Bishop of Rome was, like other bishops, chosen by the clergy and people of his city. As this arrangement was a frequent source of factions and schisms, the temporal rulers of Italy, Byzantines, Goths, Franks and Germans, reserved to themselves the privilege of confirmation. This would have rendered the Supreme Pontiff a mere creature of the State, had not the great Hildebrand and other champions of ecclesiastical liberty prepared the way for emancipation by the establishment of an electoral body, closely united and endowed with the sole right of choosing and enthroning the spiritual chief of Christendom. From the date of Alexander III.'s legislation, restricting the right of election to the college of Cardinals, the old-time schisms, with their innumerable antipopes, disappeared; and were it not for the deplorable occurrences of 1378, when the Cardinals attempted unanimously to unthrone the Pope they had, whether willingly or unwillingly, unanimously elected, it could be truly said that Alexander's bull, *Licet de vitanda discordia*, had secured to the Church for six hundred years, a succession of Pontiffs whose title had never caused a ripple of doubt or contradiction. This will be considered truly providential, not to say miraculous, by any one who is acquainted with the fate of elective monarchies.

Our author, after an exhaustive investigation of the history of papal conclaves, explains clearly the rules laid down for the government of the Church during the interregnum, the place and conduct of the conclave,

the modes of voting, the meaning and influence of exclusive *vetos*, the election and crowning of the new Vicar of Christ.

THE MONASTERY OF THE GRANDE CHARTREUSE. By a Carthusian monk. English edition abridged from the French. Sold for the monastery by Burns & Oates. London.

This little volume aims at giving an accurate description of the renowned solitude of the Grand Chartreuse with an account of the life led by the contemplative Carthusian monks. The translation is the work of the writer of the interesting article on "Petrarch and the Carthusians," which appears in this number of the REVIEW. We are disposed to regret that the translator saw fit to abridge the first two chapters which dealt with the history of the monastery.

THE LIFE OF ST. PHILIP NERI, APOSTLE OF ROME. By *Alfonso, Cardinal Capecelatro* Translated by Thomas Alder Pope, M.A., of the Oratory. Second edition. 2 volumes, small octavo. London: Burns & Oates; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

Upon its first appearance in an English dress some twelve years ago, we extended a hearty welcome to this excellent work of Cardinal Capecelatro. Nothing remains now but to congratulate the publishers and the translator upon their success, as evidenced by the demand for a second edition, and to again recommend the study of St. Philip Neri to the clergy and faithful.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS PER MODUM CONFERENTIARUM AUCTORE CLARISSIMO. *P. Benjamin Elbel, O. S. F.* Novis curio edidit. B. F. Irenæus Bierbaum, O. S. F. Vol. II., Pars. VII., De statibus particularibus. Pars VIII., De sacramentis in genere atque de Baptismo, Confirmatione, Extrema Unctione, Eucharistia et ordine in specie. Paderbonae, 1892. Ex typographia Bonifaciana. New York: Benziger Bros.

In our January number for 1892 we gave an extended notice of this admirable work and explained the rank held by Father Elbel amongst moral theologians. In our April number for the same year we again called our readers' attention to the publication of Parts IV., V. and VI. Parts VII., VIII., IX. and X. have now been published, completing the work.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

WETZER UND WELTE'S KIRCHENLEXIKON, ODER ENCYCLOPEDIE DER KATHOLISCHEN THEOLOGIE UND IHRER HULFSWISSENSCHAFTEN. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Last number appeared, No. 93, bringing down to *Oranien.*

LETTERS OF ST. ALPHONSUS MARIA DE LIGUORI. Translated from the Italian. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.SS.R. Part I., General Correspondence. Vol. III. Benziger Brothers. New York. 1894.

THE BELOVED DISCIPLE. By the *Rev. Father Rawes, DD.* Third edition, with a sermon on St. John, by St. Charles Borromeo. London: Burns & Oates.

CARMINA MARIANA. By *Orby Shipley, M.A.* Second edition. London and New York: Burns & Oates. Received from Benziger Brothers.

THE LOVER OF SOULS; OR, SHORT CONFERENCES ON THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS. By a Priest. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1894.

LIFE OF THE PRINCESS BORGHESE (*née* Talbot). By *Chevalier Zeloni.* Translated by Lady Martin. London: Burns & Oates.

ST. THOMAS'S PRIORY; OR, THE STORY OF ST. AUSTIN'S, STAFFORD. By *Joseph Gillou.* London: Burns & Oates.

70759

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM